

Also, petition of post-office employees of Mendota, Ill., for increase of pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of United Mine Workers of America, Local Union No. 1722, Oglesby, Ill., for an embargo on foodstuffs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Memorial of Boston Branch of Railway Mail Association favoring salary increase; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GLYNN: Petition of 20 members Woman's Foreign Missionary Society of Shelton Congregational Church, of Shelton; 35 people of Torrington; Woman's Foreign and Home Missionary Society of Waterbury; Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of 33 members, of Torrington; and Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of 33 people, of Torrington, all in the State of Connecticut, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Papers to accompany House bill 18474, to pension Lewis J. Moore; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: Petitions of post-office clerks of Ventura County, San Jose, Oxnard, Pacific Grove, and Salinas, Cal., for increase in pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Evidence in support of House bill 18617, granting pension to Albert McAllister; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Henry R. Fitten and 18 other post-office employees of Bellaire, Ohio, for increase in salaries; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. JAMES: Petition of sundry postal employees, asking for increase in salary; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LIEB: Petition of the railway mail clerks, post-office clerks, letter carriers, and rural-delivery carriers, of Evansville, Ind., to Congress to grant them an increase in pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for relief of Sarah Battle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany a bill for the relief of Thomas J. Lamar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany a bill for relief of Thomas J. Westfall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: Papers to accompany House bill for relief of Watson F. Bisbee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCLINTIC: Petition of employees of post offices of Altus and Mangum, Okla., asking increase in salary; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MEEKER: Petitions of Eddy & Eddy Manufacturing Co., California Tanning Co., Charles S. Lewis & Co., Alvey Manufacturing Co., and Koerber-Brenner Co., all of St. Louis, Mo.; also Farm Supply Co., of Lebanon, Mo., and E. G. Trimble, of Kansas City, Mo., in favor of 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of Louis W. Hilker and Bottlers' Union, Local No. 187, both of St. Louis, Mo., in favor of an embargo on foodstuffs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOON: Papers to accompany a bill for the relief of James Beshens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany a bill for the relief of Lou Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany a bill for the relief of Martha M. Buchanan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NORTH: Petition of postal employees of Indiana, Pa., asking for increase in pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RAINY: Memorial of Woman's Christian Temperance Union and 33 people of Methodist Episcopal Church, of Rockport, Ill., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAKER: Memorial of National Housewives League of New York, indorsing the Stephens-Ashurst bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REILLY: Petitions of employees of the post offices of Neenah, Oshkosh, and Ripon, Wis., asking for increase of salary; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ROWE: Petition of Valentine & Co., of New York, in re pneumatic-tube service in post office service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of Brotherhood of Calvary Baptist Church, of Washington, in re prohibition legislation for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, memorial of Board of Directors of the Troy (N. Y.) Chamber of Commerce, in re harbor improvements in New York State, as recommended in House Document No. 1387 of Sixty-

second Congress, third session; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ROWLAND: Memorial of the Board of Temperance, Prohibition, and Public Morals of the Methodist Episcopal Church, relative to sale, etc., of liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: Two petitions of sundry postal employees, asking for increase in salaries; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Petition of Board of Temperance of the Methodist Episcopal Church, asking passage of certain prohibition laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Live Stock Association of America, asking for the repeal of the oleomargarine tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOWNER: Petition of W. L. Ferris and 200 other citizens of Shenandoah, Iowa, favoring national constitutional prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania: Memorial of Conshohocken Branch, No. 1275, United Association of Post Office Clerks, asking for the passage of House bill 17806; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, December 19, 1916.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, give us such a sense of the Divine greatness and power and glory that we may always approach Thee with reverence and godly fear. We bless Thee that in the revelation of the great plan of life that Thou has given to men there is no conflict between the facts of Thy kingdom and the facts of human life, that there is no conflict between the forces that make for the establishment of the everlasting kingdom and the forces that are for the welfare and the uplift and the refinement and the highest achievement of life in this world. We know that only through the refinement of spirit can we have the far-reaching vision of the things of God, and that the pure in heart see Thee, the great God of us all. So we pray that Thou wilt give to us that vision of spiritual things that will illumine our minds and hearts and lead us in the discharge of the duties of this day. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Vice President being absent, the President pro tempore [WILLARD SAULSBURY, a Senator from the State of Delaware] took the chair.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

DEPENDENT FAMILIES OF ENLISTED MEN (H. DOC. NO. 1759).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting a deficiency estimate in the amount of \$8,500,000 for the support of dependent families of enlisted men in the Army, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION (S. DOC. NO. 643).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the National Forest Reservation Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservation and the Protection of Game and ordered to be printed.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS (S. DOC. NO. 642).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Chief Clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact and conclusion filed by the court in the cause of Faxon, Horton & Gallagher; Long Bros. Grocery Co.; A. Rieger; Rothenberg & Schloss; Ryley, Wilson & Co.; and Van Noy News Co. v. United States, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

SENATOR FROM NEW MEXICO.

Mr. CATRON. I present the credentials of A. A. JONES, duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of New Mexico a Senator from that State to represent that State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years beginning on the 4th day of March, 1917, which I ask may be received.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The credentials will be printed in the RECORD and placed on the files of the Senate.

The credentials are as follows:

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November, 1916, A. A. JONES was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of New Mexico a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1917.

Witness: His excellency our governor, William C. McDonald, and our seal hereto affixed at Santa Fe, this 7th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1916.

[SEAL.]

WILLIAM C. McDONALD,
Governor.

By the governor:

ANTONIO LUCERO,
Secretary of State.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 7095) extending the time for completion of the bridge across the Delaware River, authorized by an act entitled "An act to authorize the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. and the Pennsylvania & Newark Railroad Co., or their successors, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Delaware River," approved the 24th day of August, 1912.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 6116) providing for the taxation of lands of the Winnebago Indians and the Omaha Indians in the State of Nebraska with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 199. An act to regulate the importation of viruses, serums, toxins, and analogous products, to regulate interstate traffic in said articles, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6876. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations,' approved March 3, 1891," approved January 11, 1915; and

H. R. 17020. An act making an appropriation for the benefit of the Aviation Corps of the Department of War, and repealing the provisions of certain acts relating to the acquisition of a site and the erection of a public building at Ripon, Wis.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 1788) for the relief of Thomas M. Jones, and it was thereupon signed by the President pro tempore.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented a petition of the Society of Colonial Wars of the District of Columbia, praying for the enactment of legislation to protect the flag of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GRONNA. I submit a memorial and ask that it be read and printed in the RECORD with the name of the first signer.

There being no objection, the memorial was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Senator A. J. GRONNA:

DEAR SIR: We, the members of the Cleveland Farmers' Club, hereby petition you to protest against the proposed embargo on foodstuffs for the following reasons:

1. That the farmer on account of the short crop is not receiving a high enough price to make up for the shortage.
2. That the farmer should receive an increased price for the products which he sells when he has to pay an increased price for everything he buys.
3. That we believe the proposed embargo, if passed, would result in decreased acreage, and, of course, decreased supply.

W. E. CAMPBELL,
(And others).

Mr. KENYON (for Mr. WEEKS) presented petitions of sundry citizens of Massachusetts, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also (for Mr. WEEKS) presented a memorial of Local Union No. 482, Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paper Hangers of America, of Somerville, Mass., remonstrating against the high cost of living, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also (for Mr. WEEKS) presented petitions of sundry citizens of Massachusetts, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the price of coal, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KERN presented petitions of sundry citizens of Indiana, praying for the establishment of a national park among the sand dunes of northern Indiana, which were referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a petition of the Sladalberts Catholic Congregation, of South Bend, Ind., praying for prohibition in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. OVERMAN (for Mr. SIMMONS) presented petitions of sundry citizens of North Carolina, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FERNALD presented petitions of sundry citizens of Maine, praying for an increase in the salaries of postal employees, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. WARREN presented a petition of Local Branch No. 555, Letter Carriers' Association, of Cheyenne, Wyo., praying for an increase in the salaries of postal employees, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. PHELAN presented a petition of the Chambers of Commerce of San Jose, Mayfield, Sunnyvale, Mountain View, and Santa Clara, all in the State of California, praying for the establishment of an aviation base in the Santa Clara Valley, Cal., which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE—FORAGE CROPS.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Senate bill 7343 appropriating the sum of \$5,000 to be expended by the Secretary of Agriculture in cooperative work in forage-crop investigations in the State of Washington was referred to the Committee on Appropriations. It should have gone to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I ask that the Committee on Appropriations be relieved from the further consideration of the bill and that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, that course will be taken.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. FLETCHER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5386) for the relief of James Campbell, reported adversely thereon, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5318) for the relief of Frederick Chateau, reported adversely thereon, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. GRONNA, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 583) relating to the disposal of coal and mineral deposits in Indian lands, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report (No. 882) thereon.

Mr. BRADY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7763) for the relief of Stephen J. Simpson, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report (No. 883) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 7157) for the relief of Sarah De Witt, reported adversely thereon, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine, from the Committee on Pensions, submitted a report (No. 885) accompanied by a bill (S. 7486) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, which was read twice by its title, the bill being a substitute for the following Senate bills heretofore referred to that committee:

- S. 365. Celia A. Blodgett.
- S. 1190. William W. Olmsted.
- S. 1629. John W. Hendrickson.
- S. 1754. Aaron C. Rodocker.
- S. 1761. John J. Schliessmann.
- S. 1762. Richard Mitchell.
- S. 2210. Blanche F. Nash.
- S. 2280. John Mayfield.
- S. 2571. William W. Prine.
- S. 2572. John H. Jarrett.
- S. 2616. William Richey.
- S. 2739. Mary P. Ross.
- S. 2942. Isaac R. Johnson.
- S. 2946. Columbus Walton.
- S. 3014. Sada Gleeson.
- S. 3123. Severn L. Parks.
- S. 3204. Ellen Rush.
- S. 3282. George A. Bloese.
- S. 3300. Elizabeth Lander.
- S. 3321. George D. Smith.
- S. 3326. William J. Crocker.
- S. 3576. Peter Sheplar.
- S. 3632. La Fayette Platt.
- S. 3688. Cornelius T. Ham.
- S. 3725. Joseph C. Patterson.
- S. 3914. Mathias Eyer.
- S. 4005. Emily P. Hubbard.
- S. 4150. William H. Cleland.
- S. 4291. James K. Wesley.
- S. 4393. Henry M. Bryant.

S. 4395. Samuel D. Sherman.
 S. 4652. Elmore Y. Chase.
 S. 4678. John E. Madison.
 S. 4685. John Elliott.
 S. 4696. William C. Pope.
 S. 4714. Leona B. Hauke.
 S. 4734. Jacob W. Perkins.
 S. 4747. Levi J. Richardson.
 S. 4753. Neils Attleson.
 S. 4847. Frederick A. Churchill.
 S. 4904. James B. Thornton.
 S. 4959. John N. McClure.
 S. 4994. James T. Piggott.
 S. 5034. Thomas J. Harrison.
 S. 5134. Henry H. Niles.
 S. 5252. Ephraim Smith.
 S. 5357. Edgar P. Lewis.
 S. 5363. Solomon Terpenning.
 S. 5409. Charles Reed.
 S. 5530. John C. Cook.
 S. 5557. Joseph A. Miller.
 S. 5662. John Stouffer.
 S. 5714. James S. Sisson.
 S. 5804. John Unferfate.
 S. 5812. George R. Gibney.
 S. 5877. George M. Kimble.
 S. 5997. Charles N. Chatto.
 S. 6003. Wylie Brown.
 S. 6060. Charles Asa Clark.
 S. 6064. Louis A. Allor.
 S. 6171. Edwin D. Sweet.
 S. 6173. George O. Whitman.
 S. 6174. Alexander Faries.
 S. 6175. Thomas B. Williams.
 S. 6196. Lemuel Evans.
 S. 6238. John Walker.
 S. 6253. William H. Bradley.
 S. 6268. Charles R. Stuart.
 S. 6271. Eliakim Byard.
 S. 6307. Jasper Trimble.
 S. 6340. George G. Tuell.
 S. 6341. Matilda A. Bickford.
 S. 6345. Bailey Mitchell.
 S. 6365. Robert H. Keller.
 S. 6367. Sylvester Clark.
 S. 6386. George W. Ward.
 S. 6394. Francis J. Cousens.
 S. 6399. Simon Ridenour.
 S. 6403. Jefferson Foncannon.
 S. 6413. Angelia T. Mosier.
 S. 6418. Nathan J. Way.
 S. 6419. Enoch Jones.
 S. 6420. John W. Torrance.
 S. 6438. Charles Ainsworth.
 S. 6442. Charles Gilmore.
 S. 6456. William J. Love.
 S. 6457. Benjamin Tackitt.
 S. 6458. Grace Elizabeth Brown.
 S. 6474. Boadicea E. Dinsmore.
 S. 6480. Henry B. Burgh.
 S. 6490. Henry C. Tulleys.
 S. 6500. Ephraim J. Allen.
 S. 6527. Edwin Rogers.
 S. 6530. George Banghart.
 S. 6534. Lucy E. Sturdevant.
 S. 6535. Toyger Peterson.
 S. 6536. Royal E. Dake.
 S. 6537. Frederick W. Mase.
 S. 6539. Ruth A. McMillan.
 S. 6565. Sarah Wright.
 S. 6591. John Lamberson.
 S. 6697. Frank T. Bolton.
 S. 6600. Frances I. Wallace.
 S. 6607. Edward Neugent.
 S. 6611. Jeremiah B. Davis.
 S. 6620. John S. Stearns.
 S. 6640. Henry W. Gash.
 S. 6660. Ferdinand Davis.
 S. 6663. John Cooper.
 S. 6694. John Hudson.
 S. 6695. Henry Dolton Selby.
 S. 6700. John L. Fisher.
 S. 6706. Andrew M. Vanover.
 S. 6713. Lewis Mensch.
 S. 6728. Samuel Holliday.

S. 6732. Horace N. Holbrook.
 S. 6741. John K. Mayo.
 S. 6742. Robert F. Hedrick.
 S. 6743. Calvin Sharpnack.
 S. 6756. Charles E. Collins.
 S. 6759. John R. Sparrow.
 S. 6761. Reynold D. W. Campbell.
 S. 6762. James M. Treat.
 S. 6763. Louisa A. Atherton.
 S. 6764. Ezekial P. Rowell.
 S. 6766. Aura V. Thurston.
 S. 6767. Henry G. Mitchell.
 S. 6779. John W. Sperry.
 S. 6780. Luther B. Johnson.
 S. 6784. Edward F. Griswold.
 S. 6787. Henry H. Frampton.
 S. 6809. William F. Wilson.
 S. 6838. Charles Edgar Mason.
 S. 6860. Jonas H. Upton.
 S. 6861. David Galbreath.
 S. 6871. John Cook.
 S. 6876. Joseph S. Morgan.
 S. 6879. Watkin Countryman.
 S. 6899. Anna E. Tenney.
 S. 6907. Theodore Gerrish.
 S. 6915. Charles P. Betts.
 S. 6940. William R. Browning.
 S. 6945. Jennie Jammison Beamer.
 S. 6959. Mary J. Crandell.
 S. 6967. Charles Washington.
 S. 6984. Hugh Stevens.
 S. 6987. Adna H. Bowen.
 S. 6997. Paul Strause.
 S. 7010. John L. Skinner.
 S. 7012. William W. Nally.
 S. 7018. Andrew Goodwin.
 S. 7021. Henry Thompson.
 S. 7024. Jacob R. Stillwagon.
 S. 7025. William S. Rowe.
 S. 7030. Thomas L. Irwin.
 S. 7033. Maurice M. Kaighn.
 S. 7034. Stephen P. Colby.
 S. 7044. Job Wilbur.
 S. 7050. Minnie J. Hodge.
 S. 7053. Martin Pool.
 S. 7059. Margaret Stevenson.
 S. 7060. Samuel C. Clossin.
 S. 7061. Isaac R. Atlee.
 S. 7062. Thomas Brown.
 S. 7064. John R. Simpson.
 S. 7093. Theodore Longfellow.
 S. 7096. Kate M. White.
 S. 7100. Joseph C. Predmore.
 S. 7101. James S. White.
 S. 7144. Josephine E. Ure.
 S. 7145. William Beauchamp.
 S. 7153. Mettie Sanders.
 S. 7158. Sidney M. Smith.
 S. 7162. Joseph Chapman.
 S. 7181. John C. Mayer.
 S. 7182. William F. Wahl.
 S. 7188. John Stevens.
 S. 7212. Timothy Welch.
 S. 7213. Charles F. Smith.
 S. 7214. George Maybury.
 S. 7216. Moses E. Lowell.
 S. 7218. Levi G. Foss.
 S. 7227. Ida M. Paine.
 S. 7233. George F. Boothby.
 S. 7235. Thomas King.
 S. 7237. Anna C. Stahel.
 S. 7250. Reason D. Evensizer.
 S. 7277. Charles F. Penley.
 S. 7284. Barber B. Durgin.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 18181) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 884) thereon.

PAY OF EMPLOYEES.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I send to the desk House joint resolution 324, which has passed the House of Representatives and has been informally considered by the Senate Committee on Appropriations. The joint resolution I am sure will have

the support of every Senator. It simply provides that on the day of adjournment for the holiday recess the clerical force shall be paid then the amount that would be payable on the 1st day of January. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 324) authorizing payment of the salaries of officers and employees of Congress for December, 1916, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COMMERCE COURT.

Mr. CHILTON. By direction of the Committee on the Judiciary I ask that the bill (S. 6843) to amend an act entitled "An act to create a Commerce Court, and to amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate commerce,' approved February 4, 1887, as heretofore amended, and for other purposes," approved June 18, 1910, being Order of Business 717 on the calendar, be recommended to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be recommended to the Judiciary Committee.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and by unanimous consent the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 7477) for the relief of the heirs of Ko-mo-dal-kiah, Moses agreement allottee No. 33; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 7478) to regulate radio communication; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 7479) granting an increase of pension to Lavina A. E. Rogers (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STERLING:

A bill (S. 7480) granting an increase of pension to Aletha E. Reynolds (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KERN:

A bill (S. 7481) for the relief of Simon Bollinger; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FERNALD:

A bill (S. 7482) granting an increase of pension to James R. Eaton (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey (for Mr. O'GORMAN):

A bill (S. 7483) granting a pension to Elizabeth Du Hamel; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ASHURST:

A bill (S. 7484) to divide the State of Arizona into two judicial districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SWANSON:

A bill (S. 7485) to permanently renew patent No. 24917; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 186) authorizing the Secretary of War to issue temporary permits for additional diversions of water from the Niagara River; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILL (H. R. 18453).

Mr. McCUMBER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$10,000 for the erection of an assembly hall at the Wahpeton Indian School, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to accept the application of Richard Daeley to enter lot 8, section 31, township 147 north, of range 30 west of the fifth principal meridian, Cass Lake (Minn.) land district, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. STERLING submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$15,000 for general repairs and improvements to the present building at the Indian Boarding School for Girls, Springfield, S. Dak., etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$7,500 for repairing and improving the road leading from the asylum for insane Indians to the city of Canton, S. Dak., etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill,

which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. WARREN submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$12,000 for acquiring the Hawaiian Volcano Observatory, at Kilauea Volcano, Hawaii, and to establish in Hawaii, California, and elsewhere volcano recording under the Weather Bureau, intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$4,140 to pay Thomas W. and Alice M. Kellar for ground taken and damages on account of condemnation proceedings in square No. 2838 in the city of Washington, D. C., intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill (H. R. 19119), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

AMERICAN EXPORT TRADE.

Mr. FLETCHER submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 28), which was read and referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the report entitled "Cooperation in American Export Trade," issued by the Federal Trade Commission, be printed as a Senate Document, and that 6,000 additional copies be printed, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 2,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 3,000 copies for the use of the Federal Trade Commission.

LANDS IN WASHINGTON.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8092) confirming patents heretofore issued to certain Indians in the State of Washington, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment and agree to the conference asked for by the House, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. PITTMAN, Mr. LANE, and Mr. CLAPP conferees on the part of the Senate.

INDIAN LANDS IN NEBRASKA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 6116) providing for the taxation of the lands of the Winnebago Indians and the Omaha Indians in the State of Nebraska, which were, on page 1, line 13, to strike out "hereinafter" and insert "hereafter." On page 2, line 11, to strike out "hereinafter" and insert "hereafter."

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

H. R. 199. An act to regulate the importation of viruses, serums, toxins, and analogous products, to regulate interstate traffic in said articles, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

H. R. 6876. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations,' approved March 3, 1891," approved January 11, 1915, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Indian Depredations.

H. R. 17020. An act making an appropriation for the benefit of the Aviation Corps of the Department of War, and repealing the provisions of certain acts relating to the acquisition of a site and the erection of a public building at Ripon, Wis., was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PROHIBITION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The morning business is closed.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1082.

Mr. SMOOT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Brandegge	Clapp	Curtis
Bankhead	Bryan	Clark	Dillingham
Beckham	Catron	Colt	Fernald
Borah	Chamberlain	Culberson	Fletcher
Brady	Chilton	Cummins	Gallinger

Gore	Kirby	Penrose	Sterling
Gronna	La Follette	Phelan	Sutherland
Harding	Lane	Polindexter	Swanson
Hitchcock	Lee, Md.	Pomerene	Thomas
Hollis	McCumber	Reed	Thompson
Hughes	McLean	Saulsbury	Townsend
Husting	Martin, Va.	Sheppard	Underwood
James	Martine, N. J.	Sherman	Vardaman
Johnson, Me.	Nelson	Shields	Wadsworth
Johnson, S. Dak.	Norris	Smith, Ariz.	Walsh
Jones	Oliver	Smith, Md.	Warren
Kenyon	Overman	Smith, Mich.	Watson
Kern	Owen	Smith, S. C.	Williams
	Page	Smoot	Works

Mr. PHELAN. I desire to state that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] is detained in a committee meeting.

Mr. THOMAS. I wish to announce the necessary absence of my colleague [Mr. SHAFROTH] on account of illness. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. FLETCHER. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL] is still confined to his room by illness, and also that the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] is absent on account of illness. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. OVERMAN. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. SIMMONS] is absent to-day on account of illness in his family.

Mr. KIRBY. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. ROBINSON] on account of illness. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I wish to announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] is detained at home through illness.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-six Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] to take up Senate bill 1082.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1082) to prevent the sale and manufacture of alcoholic liquors in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I present a telegram, which I send to the desk and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read the telegram, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., December 18, 1916.

Senator MORRIS SHEPPARD,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Resolutions unanimously adopted December 18, 1916, by the Disciples and Baptist Ministerial Association of Washington, D. C., representing more than 14,000 members and nearly as many adherents:

"1. Resolved, That we earnestly oppose the proposed referendum amendment to the pending bill before the Senate of the United States providing for the prohibition of the legalized liquor traffic.

"2. Resolved further, That we appeal to the Congress of the United States, and especially to the Senators and Representatives from the dry States, to give their aggressive support to the Sheppard bill in order that the present opportunity so long fought and prayed for by the good men and women of the District of Columbia to give to the Nation a clean, moral, law-abiding, Christian Capital City may be no longer deferred."

WALTER S. DUNLOP, Chairman.
F. PAUL LONGHORNE, Secretary.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I am exceedingly anxious for the passage of the pending bill, for I know of no better Christmas present that could be given to the people of Washington and to the people of the Nation than the passage of this bill. Ever since I have been in the Senate I have been interested in prohibition for the District of Columbia and in prohibition throughout the Nation, for I came here from a prohibition State, where that issue has been one of the most vital from the time of the adoption of our State constitution. We have had, perhaps, longer and better experience with prohibition than has any other State in the Union. It became a part of our constitution as far back as 1880 and has ever since remained such. The opposition to prohibition have never been able to even have the subject resubmitted to the people of my State for a vote.

In the Sixty-third Congress I introduced Senate bill 6865 and in the Sixty-fourth Congress Senate bill 1352, providing for prohibition in the District of Columbia. These bills are fashioned largely after the Kansas law, with which I am more familiar than with the laws of any other State. The amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] contains many of the provisions of those bills, and they are a little more drastic, perhaps, than is the bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD].

I, therefore, believing in the laws of my State and the prohibition of the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors for any purpose, voted for the Smoot amendment. I would, of course, champion legislation such as is embodied in my own bills, but I am firmly of the opinion, after consultation with my fellow Senators, that those bills are more drastic than it would be possible to pass for the District of Columbia, or for the

Nation, at the present time. I am therefore heartily in favor of the bill now pending, offered by the distinguished Senator from Texas.

I want to answer, first, the argument offered by the opposition—by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE] and by some of the other Senators—that prohibition is a failure; that is, that it does not prohibit; and that it is economically and morally wrong. I think those are the principal charges that the opposition make relative to legislation of this kind, and I also think that, after 30 years of experience with this problem in my State in various capacities, I am able to say something that may clear the mind even of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey relative to this issue.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield to me for just one moment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. THOMPSON. I do.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Since the Senator from Kansas has made reference to me and to the immaculate and spotless State of Kansas, I ask him what he has to say to this: According to information gathered from statistics there was in Topeka—I believe that is in Kansas, is it not?

Mr. THOMPSON. I think so.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Topeka, which had a population of 40,000 inhabitants, approximately—

Mr. THOMPSON. The population is a little more than that, I think.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. A little more possibly now; but during the month of September, 1913, there were imported into the city of Topeka 90,062 gallons of whisky, to say nothing of beer. How does the Senator account for that if Kansas is a prohibition State?

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I will simply answer the distinguished Senator in this way: I know not where he gets his figures—

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I get them from the official returns.

Mr. THOMPSON. But I wish to say that you can prove practically anything you want to by statistics. There is an old saying that "figures never lie, but sometimes liars figure." However, the statement that is made as to the shipment of liquor into the State has nothing whatever to do with the question of its unlawful manufacture or sale. That is the question in our State. There is no law in my State prohibiting the shipment of liquor nor the personal use of liquor, but after 36 years' administration of this law we have advanced from a condition where there were saloons of the worst character, passed through the era of "speak-easies, joints, and blind tigers," which are things of the past, down to the present time, when there is not a place in the State where it is commonly known that intoxicating liquor is sold as a beverage. We have seen no necessity for any law prohibiting the shipment of liquor into the State or its personal use in the household. A law of that kind would be superfluous.

Mr. REED and Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kansas yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. THOMPSON. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. I want to ask the Senator from Kansas how long it is since the breweries of Missouri regularly delivered in their wagons beer from house to house in the city of Kansas City, Kans., the largest city in the State of Kansas?

Mr. THOMPSON. In answer to the question of the Senator from Missouri, I will say that is one of the problems that has disturbed the people of Kansas a great deal, and I have introduced a bill, which is before the Committee on the Judiciary of which the distinguished Senator from Missouri is a member, which bill has never been favorably reported, to prohibit absolutely the shipment or the delivery of beer from Missouri or from the border in any way, shape, or form. We have been battling against that evil ever since the establishment of the prohibitory law, and expect to keep it up until even Missouri can not ship liquor or send it over in a wagon or an automobile and sell it unlawfully to the people on the streets of Kansas City or elsewhere in my State.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMPSON. We have been vigorously enforcing our laws against this outrage and trying to remedy that condition for the last four or five years, and have finally succeeded in practically eliminating the practice. I am going to be frank, open, and fair about this matter. We have not had absolute prohibition in Kansas for all the 36 years it has been on our statutes.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Then, prohibition has not prevailed there.

Mr. THOMPSON. But we have in the last 10 or 12 years enforced the law vigorously; and I challenge the Senator from Missouri, or any other Senator, to point out to me any place anywhere in the State of Kansas where liquor is knowingly unlawfully sold for beverage purposes.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. REED. First, the Senator states that he has a bill to prohibit the shipping or hauling of beer or liquor from Missouri to Kansas, and that that bill is before the Judiciary Committee, of which, as he truthfully states, I am a member, and that the bill has not been reported. He seeks thereby to leave the impression that I am in some way responsible for the failure to report out the bill. Now, I want to ask the Senator two questions. First, I ask when did his bill reach the Judiciary Committee?

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that I introduced the bill early in the session, and I think the Senator is a member of the subcommittee—at least I think I received a letter to that effect—

Mr. REED. Well, you introduced the bill at this December session?

Mr. THOMPSON. Early in the first session.

Mr. REED. Do you know what day?

Mr. THOMPSON. No; but I can look it up.

Mr. REED. Do you know when it reached the Judiciary Committee?

Mr. THOMPSON. I will be glad to look that up.

Mr. REED. Now, I want to ask the Senator another question. I am going to look it up since this insinuation is made. I ask whether the Senator has ever appeared before the Judiciary Committee or asked any action whatsoever on his bill?

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I have spoken to the chairman of the subcommittee several times relative to the matter.

Mr. REED. And you just said I was the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. THOMPSON. No; the Senator is mistaken. I have not said that he was chairman of the subcommittee; but I do know that he is a member of some of the subcommittees of the Judiciary Committee before which some of my bills are pending. I do not know that he is the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. REED. Oh, yes, Mr. President. The Judiciary Committee has no regular subcommittees, as the Senator would know if he were familiar with the work of that committee. Subcommittees are created at every meeting, for special purposes, and when they have discharged those special purposes cease to exist. So the fact that I am on subcommittees does not indicate that this bill is before any subcommittee of which I am a member. I am a member now of probably 10 or 15 subcommittees.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. But I want to say—

Mr. THOMPSON. Will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. REED. Now wait until I get through with this.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think I have the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. REED. Will you not permit me to finish?

Mr. THOMPSON. I permitted you to ask me a question, but not to make a speech.

Mr. REED. But I want to correct a statement, and if I am not permitted to correct it now pleasantly, I will correct it in a much more forcible manner in a few moments.

Mr. THOMPSON. I care not how forcibly you correct it right now.

Mr. REED. Well, that is what I want to do right now. I say that, if I am a member of any such subcommittee as the Senator refers to, I have no knowledge of it, and the Senator has never in the world mentioned the fact to me nor asked me to take any action. When he does so, I am prepared to say now that I am in favor of any bill that is drawn in a manner in conformity with law and that has common sense in it, of course, that will prohibit the shipment of liquor into "dry" territory. If the Senator has a bill of that kind, he will have no difficulty in getting it reported out. Now, we have disposed of that matter. The Senator said he wanted to ask me a question.

Mr. THOMPSON. That was the question I was going to ask the Senator, if he would be favorable to my bill?

Mr. REED. I do not know. I do not know whether your bill is soundly drawn, but I will be favorable to a bill that soundly expresses the principle to which I refer.

Mr. THOMPSON. I am glad to know that the Senator will contribute his able experience in that direction to my bill.

Mr. REED. We were on a theme, the matter of the sale of liquor in Kansas. Is it not true to-day that, by common consent, agreement, and arrangement, liquor is regularly delivered in Kansas City, Kans., by the brewers and distillers from house to house; that they haul it in their wagons through the streets of Kansas City, Kans., with practically the same regularity as they do through the streets of Kansas City, Mo.?

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I am glad to say that is not true; there is no agreement or arrangement of that character. We have been bothered a great deal by things of this character in the past, but have practically stopped that sort of business by proper court proceedings.

Mr. REED. Is it not done?

Mr. THOMPSON. The breweries of Missouri, in open violation of the law, sometimes do that thing; and we are endeavoring in every way to fight that evil. I am very glad to know that even the people of Kansas City, Mo., from whence the distinguished Senator from Missouri now hails, have recently decided by a vote on prohibition in a way that will aid Kansas materially in the enforcement of its valued law in the future.

Mr. REED. What law does the Senator refer to?

Mr. THOMPSON. The prohibition law submitted in the State of Missouri at the last election. If I am reliably informed by the returns from the newspapers, prohibition carried in the city of Kansas City or in Jackson County, the county in which Kansas City is located.

Mr. REED. That is true.

Mr. THOMPSON. And I understand that there was a majority for State-wide prohibition throughout the State, leaving out only the city of St. Louis.

Mr. REED. It is true that—

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not care to carry on a controversy with the Senator relative to this matter.

Mr. REED. Well, I can readily see why the Senator does not want to be pinned down to any concrete facts. I will talk about it later.

Mr. THOMPSON. The Senator can ask me any question and I shall be very glad to answer it; but I am glad that the good people of the State of Missouri are fast falling into line for this great reform, which is vital to the civilization of the Nation. The breweries of Missouri have given us more trouble in the enforcement of our prohibitory law than all the other people on the face of the earth, and I hope the time will soon come when that condition will not prevail.

While I am talking on this question I will state that I have here an article from the Joplin Journal, in the Senator's own State, relative to how prohibition has operated in Kansas. It is headed "Prohibition killed Kansas." I should like to send it to the desk and have the Secretary read it, so as to let us know how the people of Missouri feel toward this beneficial law which has been enacted and enforced in my State except for the imposition of the breweries from the State of Missouri.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

[From the Joplin Journal.]

PROHIBITION KILLED KANSAS.

The grape industry is not the only thing ruined by the prohibition in Kansas. In fact, prohibition has killed about every industry in Kansas, excepting the raising of wheat and corn, alfalfa, and fruit, and live stock, and potatoes, and peas, and cabbage, and garden sassa, and chickens, and ducks, and geese, and horses, and mules, and blooded cattle. It busted up quite all of our flourishing saloons and beer gardens and paralyzed many of our prominent gamblers. It absolutely killed the bartenders' union. Where once the thriving saloon sent the clamorous odor of its prosperity out upon the sidewalks and clear across the street we find nothing but shoe stores, dry goods stores, meat markets, clothing stores, grocery stores, and other sordid activities of an unhappy people. Where once you saw the long strides of men on Saturday night going joyfully into the rooms where the doors were locked securely, where there was sawdust on the floor and a merry crowd at the mahogany bar treating all around, and a man could get his salary check cashed and spend it all right on his boon companions and go enthusiastically home and break up furniture and give his wife a black eye, instead of all these manifestations of a prosperous and thirsty citizenship, as in our saloon days, we see men go quietly into butcher shops and grocery stores and then go home lugging great bundles of supplies for their wives and children—beef-steak for supper, Sunday dinner, etc. Ah, what a sad result of the banishment of saloons. Prohibition has left little of Kansas except her fields, and factories, and schools, and stores, and pens of fat cattle, and her sober and happy and prosperous people.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. THOMPSON. I yield.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I should like to ask whether that is an editorial or a paid advertisement for the Antisaloon League of Kansas?

Mr. THOMPSON. That is an editorial appearing in the Joplin Journal, a Missouri newspaper.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. The Senator is sure that it is not a paid-for article?

Mr. THOMPSON. I feel sure that it is not.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. How does the Senator know, let me ask?

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, I think it is not. I know of no one who has paid for it.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Well, I do not know.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think they have profited somewhat by a little bit of the good results of prohibition just spreading over into the State of Missouri, all along the line.

Mr. President, before proceeding further I wish to call attention to a certain propaganda against this bill conducted by the National Wholesale Liquor Dealers' Association of this country and to certain telegrams and communications which have been sent to various people of my State in an effort to defeat this legislation. In this connection I want to call attention also to the way in which this effort has been received by the people of my State who have been operating for so many years under this law. I send to the desk copies of a couple of telegrams, one from the National Wholesale Liquor Dealers' Association to Charles E. Gehring, of the New York Hotel Review, who, I understand, is at the head of the hotel association, where they expect to get some sympathy even in prohibition States, and Mr. Gehring's reply to the telegram, which I should like to have read as part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

CINCINNATI, OHIO, January 23, 1916.

MR. CHAS. E. GEHRING,
New York Hotel Review:

Senate Judiciary Committee has reported out favorably bill to make the District of Columbia dry. Will you please assist by sending telegrams to the officers of every hotel men's association in the United States, urging them to take immediate action to have thousands of telegrams and letters sent to the United States Senators from their States urging them to vote and work against this bill? Request the hotel men to have telegrams sent also to merchants from whom they purchase supplies. Please use utmost endeavors and draw on us up to \$100 to pay for expense of your telegrams. Wire us what it will cost to have you send a letter to every hotel in the United States along same lines. Many thanks for your cooperation. Wire us what you are doing.

NATIONAL WHOLESALE LIQUOR DEALERS' ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA.

—
MR. GEHRING'S REPLY.

NEW YORK, January 30, 1916.

NATIONAL WHOLESALE LIQUOR DEALERS'
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
Cincinnati, Ohio:

Telegrams have gone out to every hotel association of record in the United States to-day. Will mail you copy. A letter to every hotel man individually in the United States would cost, for postage, letterheads, envelopes, duplicating, filling in, addressing, and mailing, complete, approximately \$350. While a big task, we are prepared for the good of the cause to proceed forthwith if deemed advisable by you. You will have our undivided cooperation to the exclusion of matters of paramount importance until fight is won.

CHARLES E. GEHRING,
New York Hotel Review.

Mr. THOMPSON. A telegram was sent to Mr. J. M. Bradbury, proprietor of the Madison Hotel, Madison, Kans.; and he wrote me February 5, 1916, as follows:

Hon. W. H. THOMPSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Inclosed please find a letter I have received which has been sent out broadcast to all the hotel men. I am not with this party, and believe a great majority of the hotel men in Kansas are for the bill. Push it through if possible. We are here solid for the bill. You can see what the liquor men are doing. This is an insult to the hotel men as a class.

Trusting the bill will go through, I remain,

Yours, very truly,

J. M. BRADBURY.

Here is one of the letters from Mr. Gehring, written to Mr. W. F. Briggs, proprietor of the hotel at Pratt, Kans., and another one written to Mr. James Murphy, at Newton, Kans., proprietor of a hotel there. These were returned to me, the one to Mr. Briggs with this comment:

Make her as dry as hades.

[Laughter.]

I should like to send that letter to the Secretary's desk and have it read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Secretary will read the communication.

The Secretary read as follows:

NEW YORK CITY, February 10, 1916.

Mr. W. F. BRIGGS, Pratt, Kans.

MY DEAR SIR: The Senate Judiciary Committee in Washington has reported out favorably the bill to make District of Columbia dry. Do you realize the tremendous importance and effect of this bill if passed and signed? Immediate action on your part only can defeat the measure.

Will you please deluge your Senators with an avalanche of telegrams and letters urging their staunchest and most powerful opposition? Every one of your employees and every merchant you trade with should send a telegram or letter, or both, at once to your Senators.

Will you please urge every member of your association to enlist in this most important battle at this very moment being waged against you? Please do not delay. Immediate action is the watchword.

If this bill passes, the National Senate will be on record for national prohibition. Don't overlook this!

I am writing you at the suggestion of the hotel men of Washington and the District of Columbia, and trust that you will come to their aid, whether or not your State is "dry." If you are opposed to prohibition, confiscation, and the other un-American practices which follow in the wake of this agitation, won't you please put your shoulder to the wheel and have your friends and employees do likewise? Write your letters to-day, please.

Yours for true liberty,

CHAS. E. GEHRING,
Managing Editor Hotel Review.

Mr. REED. What is the date of that?

The SECRETARY. The date is February 10, 1916.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, with that letter evidently there has been inclosed to me the envelope which was transmitted with it, all printed "Hon. W. H. THOMPSON, Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.," and evidently stamped and ready to send out. He returned that letter to me with the comment I have mentioned.

The letter from Mr. Murphy, calling my attention to this propaganda, is as follows:

NEWTON, KANS., March 4, 1916.

Hon. W. H. THOMPSON,

Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In regard to the inclosed circular, which I had been instructed to send you by the Hotel Men's Association, would like to say that I am very much opposed to the sale of liquor in any community or in any State, and I sincerely hope that the United States Senate will go on record as being in favor of national prohibition. This is contrary to what the Hotel Men's Association are advocating; but, as I have already stated, I am bitterly opposed to the sale of intoxicants in any form, and will spend money to that end.

Yours, truly,

J. W. MURPHY.

Mr. President, a number of years ago—about 1910, as I remember—the brewery interests of the country were circulating literature over the Nation when prohibition was ripe in various other sections of the country, and particularly in the State of Illinois and in the city of Chicago, willfully slandering the State of Kansas as to the enforcement of this law, and our people as to how we conducted ourselves in the administration of the law. It reached such a point that the governor of our State, to refute those slanderous charges, wrote to practically every district judge of the State, every mayor, and every police officer, and received something like 200 letters showing how the law was enforced, and how it operated in every section of the State. This governor—Gov. W. R. Stubbs, who opposed me in the senatorial contest four years ago—took the letters with him to Chicago and made a notable address there in the Great Northern Theater on March 27, 1910. I desire to call attention to various letters that were written by those in official positions having charge of the enforcement of this law, to the governor at that time, and which were later collected by the Kansas State Temperance Union, and then let us see whether the foreign breweries are correct in their charges, or the men on the ground who hold high official positions and are intrusted with the responsibility of the enforcement of the law.

I desire first to call attention to a letter from the chief justice of our State, Hon. W. A. Johnston, which was written March 24, 1910, to the governor:

I will say that, judging from litigation before our court, the prohibitory law was enforced at first with some difficulty. Public opinion and greater experience, however, appears to have overcome that difficulty, and the law, although transgressed occasionally, is now effectually enforced, and with no more opposition or difficulty than any other law prohibiting and punishing ordinary offenses.

The closing of the saloons and the joints has had an excellent effect upon the morals and material interests of the people of the State. Among the consequences of prohibition are better homes, happier families, higher standards of intelligence and education, and, of course, a great reduction in crime. No statement or proof is needed to support the claim that these results follow the closing of saloons and the effective enforcement of the prohibitory law. They are the natural and inevitable results, and these have been realized in Kansas.

Yours, very truly,

W. A. JOHNSTON,
Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Kansas.

I also wish to call attention to a letter from that brilliant editor William Allen White, who is the author of many books of note, including A Certain Rich Man and many articles of prominence. The most recent that I can remember is Who Killed Cock

Robin, published in a late number of Collier's. This is what he states under the heading "Emporia, Kans., October 22, 1909."

The letter is rather lengthy, Mr. President, and I will simply ask that it be printed as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no objection, it is so ordered.

The letter referred to is as follows:

EMPORIA, KANS., October 22, 1909.

MY DEAR SIR: I have your very kind letter of the 1st asking me something about prohibition in Kansas. I have grown from childhood to the age of 42 years in Kansas, and I probably am greatly prejudiced in its favor. As a young man, from the time I was 16 years old until I was 22, I never saw an open saloon. I know of thousands of children in the State who never saw a saloon. The law was adopted in 1881 and has been enforced ever since. Of course it is enforced better now than it ever was before because a generation has grown up under the law that knows nothing else. The State never was as clean as it is to-day. The liquor law is enforced as well as the law against horse stealing, which does not mean that there are not more or less thieves in the jails for horse stealing and that there are not more or less men in the jails for selling liquor. These laws are violated and will be violated until the end of time.

If there were no violations of the law, the law would not be needed. It happens just now that during the month of August our jails are empty. There is not an able-bodied man or woman in the poorhouse. We have never had any trouble at all to keep our town and county and State going. The town of Emporia is being paved from one end to the other with brick and asphalt without a dollar's worth of liquor money in it. The revenues of Kansas for nearly 30 years have been raised without liquor licenses, and we have built the best system of schools in the world. Taxes are low because the average workman owns his own home, and thus the taxes are spread out upon thousands of working people who are thrifty, honest, and hard working rather than upon hundreds of landlords who are taxed to maintain the criminal costs in the courts. The average district court criminal docket of Lyon County is five or six cases. And it costs no more to enforce the prohibitory law than it does any other law on the statute books. The taxes last year were as follows:

	Mills.
County tax	3.5
City tax	6.48
School tax	5
	14.98

There were 100 cases in city police court from January 1 to September 1. Of these 17 were for drunkenness and 2 for bootlegging. The rest were for crap shooting, violating gas filters' ordinance; 19 were for throwing manure in alleys, and other minor charges. I trust that I have answered your questions, and if there is anything further that I can say, kindly let me know.

Truly and sincerely, yours,

W. A. WHITE.

Mr. THOMPSON. I desire also to call attention to a letter written by Hon. F. D. Coburn, secretary of the State board of agriculture for many years, and who has the distinction, perhaps, of being the only man in my State, and in any other State I have ever heard of, who refused an appointment to the United States Senate in order to hold that distinguished position as the head of our agricultural department, and a man who has been favorably mentioned at various times in Republican administrations for the high position of Secretary of Agriculture.

Hon. F. D. Coburn, secretary of the State board of agriculture, says:

Prohibition was never before so popular in Kansas as now, after a 30 years' trial. Its effects upon all phases of society's welfare have been helpfully wholesome and the aforesaid noisy threats of resubmission are no longer heard, even in whispers.

"Prohibition is in the very air; its invincible hosts on the way are being augmented by reinforcements at every crossroads. Aided, led, the forces of rebellion made a long and stubborn resistance to our national authority, but their banners trailed in defeat at Appomattox before the blue-coated legions of Grant. The forces behind the saloon are in rebellion against society and morality and are facing their Appomattox, for which Chicago may be but another name.

This is written in connection with the Chicago campaign.

I desire also to call attention to a letter from the mayor of my old home town, Garden City, relative to the enforcement of the law there, in which he says:

GARDEN CITY, KANS., March 22, 1910.

HON. W. R. STUBBS,
Governor of Kansas, Topeka, Kans.:

Replying to yours of the 19th relative to the liquor business in our city, will say that there is not a saloon or joint in the city and has not been for 25 years. That there is not a business house vacant in the town and we are compelled to build. Real estate is higher than ever before, and our streets are well lighted. Little or no drunkenness on our streets, and our taxes are not burdensome. Our city never collected one dollar of taxes from a saloon or joint keeper during all its history.

ZEPH ROBERTS, Acting Mayor.

In this connection I desire also to call attention to a letter from the marshal of the same town, which I will simply have made a part of my remarks without reading, written by Mr. A. Lincoln Logan, city marshal.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter referred to is as follows:

GARDEN CITY, March 21, 1910.

HON. W. R. STUBBS,
Governor State of Kansas, Topeka, Kans.

DEAR SIR: I received your inquiry to-day in regard to enforcement of the prohibitory law, and in reply will say that I have been deputy marshal here since May 24, 1909, and was appointed city marshal January 13, 1909.

I find that crime and disorder diminish accordingly with the strict enforcement of the prohibitory law, or even by the employment of officers that are known to favor the strict enforcement of the law. Where there is no secret detective force, as is the case here, actual convictions are hard to secure. Garden City has a population of perhaps 4,500 persons and there is but the one city marshal. Have had only one drunk before the police judge in four weeks, and would also state that when the sugar mill closed here in January, throwing perhaps 400 men out of employment, not a single arrest was necessary for any city ordinance or State law. No extra police or extra help has been required through this time.

Hoping that the above will be satisfactory, I remain,

Yours, respectfully,

A. LINCOLN LOGAN,
City Marshal.

Mr. THOMPSON. I have here a letter from the mayor of Winfield, Kans., in the southwestern section of the State, that I desire to have made a part of my remarks, and one from Salina, Kans., in the north central section of the State, and from the mayor of Wellington, from Independence, from Parsons, Hiawatha, Fort Scott, Emporia, Ottawa, Concordia, and Beloit, coming practically from every section of the State, which I ask to have included in my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the letters will be included in the Senator's remarks.

The letters referred to are as follows:

WINFIELD, KANS., March 22, 1910.

Gov. W. R. STUBBS, Topeka, Kans.:

In reply to your telegram will state that I believe that there is less liquor sold in Winfield than there has been at any time in my knowledge of the town, which has been about 32 years. We have an occasional bootlegger that will sell bottles of liquor from his pocket, but the first man that gets drunk gives him away and causes his arrest. In that way we eliminate the bootlegger. Joints are things of past in our city. As to vacant property, we have none; on other hand, we have erected about 75 residences each year for past two years. Property values have increased at least one-third and rentals at least one-fourth. Bank deposits past two years have increased 33 per cent. Laboring men are all employed and invest their money in necessities of life and purchase homes for themselves and betterment of their families. At least 90 per cent of our people favor prohibition laws in State; in fact, you can hardly find anyone that would want to go back to the old system.

CHAS. M. WALLACE, Mayor.

SALINA, KANS., March 22, 1910.

W. R. STUBBS, Topeka, Kans.:

For several years after prohibition amendment was adopted Salina collected fines from joints. Quite a revenue was derived, but it was all expended in court costs and care of criminals and destitute poor, made so from the effect of the liquor traffic. No relief for the taxpayer was had under this system. Every municipal election was fought on the issue of wet or dry and no thought given to the business interest of city. This plan has been abandoned. No man can now be elected to office who is known to be in sympathy with the liquor business. The results are very gratifying. We have time to give attention to the business interests of the city. It is very rare a drunken man can be seen on our streets. The laborers are buying and building homes, and Saturday nights the streets are crowded with them and their families enjoying the benefits of an industrious life. Public improvements are going forward as never before. No empty rooms or buildings in the city. Building permits this month aggregate \$80,000. Over \$2,000,000 on deposit in our banks and the town full of boys grown to manhood who have never seen an open saloon. I look for national prohibition within 10 years' time.

C. B. KIRTLAND, Mayor.

WELLINGTON, KANS., March 22, 1910.

HON. W. R. STUBBS, Topeka, Kans.:

Wellington has not had a saloon for 25 years, nor an open joint for 10 years. There has been more material prosperity and a greater increase in population than ever before in the history of the city. No decent citizen, no person worth having as a citizen, would permit a saloon or joint to run or even open in their city.

GEO. H. HUNTER.

INDEPENDENCE, KANS., March 22, 1910.

Gov. STUBBS, Topeka, Kans.:

This is one of the cities of Kansas that strictly enforces the prohibitory law of the State. We have no empty storerooms. No empty houses. Real estate has not decreased in value. Taxes are not burdensome. Crimes and misdemeanors are scarce and all conditions are better because of said enforcement.

F. C. MOSES, Mayor.

PARSONS, KANS., March 22, 1910.

Gov. W. R. STUBBS, Topeka, Kans.:

Since prohibition our arrests for crime have been reduced over 50 per cent. Decrease in the sale of liquor has been over 75 per cent. No increase in taxes. No vacant business houses in our city. Real estate has doubled in the past four years.

J. L. WAITE, Mayor.

BELOIT, KANS., March 21, 1910.

Hon. W. R. STUBBS, Topeka, Kans.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR: Answering your letter of the 19th instant, as to the charges made by the liquor and brewery interests in the Chicago fight for prohibition, in which they charge that prohibition in Kansas has worked great havoc with our business and caused more drunkenness and crime than prevailed under the open saloon.

You say they charge also that more liquor is being sold in Kansas than ever before; that it makes taxation burdensome; that our business houses are vacant; and that it has reduced the value of real estate all over the State.

Now, so far as Beloit and Mitchell County are concerned these charges are not true, but on the other hand are absolutely false. Since I was elected mayor of Beloit nine years ago there has not been an open saloon in our town. The wholesale liquor dealers and brewers of Kansas City and St. Joseph, Mo., by their Richard Roe & John Doe C. O. D. Express Co. shipments made us lots of trouble, but they can't do it any more, under the present law. Now and then a bootlegger causes us some trouble yet, but we get him first or last, and he don't bootleg any more. Now for the truth of their charges. Nobody's business has been wrecked or gone to havoc except it be the saloon man. There are no vacant business houses in our town, but we are building many new and larger ones to-day. Real estate has more than thrived in value in the last six years, both in the city, and the country surrounding it; our banks are full to overflowing with the people's money. Drunkenness is almost unknown in our city; the man now to get drunk must go to Kansas City, or St. Joseph, Mo., or send his money there and have it shipped to him here, and that's most too much trouble for so little gain. Our city taxes may be a trifle higher since we quit licensing the saloons, but nobody complains; our people prefer prohibition as we now have it to-day, no matter how high you put the license.

Yours, very truly,

W. M. MITCHELL, Mayor.

HIAWATHA, KANS., March 21, 1910.

W. R. STUBBS,
Governor, Topeka, Kans.

DEAR SIR: We have not had any saloons in Hiawatha for 35 years and would not have them under any conditions. Our tax is as low as any other State with saloons; our sidewalks are better than in many other cities; our homes are better kept than in many cities, and all without the saloon license; very little bootlegging, and what there is is very soon picked up and punished. We have not one business house empty, everything full, and all doing well, and not any empty residence houses, and not any poor from the saloon business, as we have the best fed and housed and clothed people in any State where they have the run trade; we have better schools and churches and society than any country where they have saloons, and property is not running down in price, but on the boom; city property is high and farms close in sell very high; one sold last month for \$350 per acre, not very well improved. That does not look as if things are running down very fast, and I know by talking with our people that 90 per cent are solid for prohibition.

Yours, very respectfully,

J. T. GRIMES, Mayor.

FORT SCOTT, KANS., March 22, 1910.

Gov. W. R. STUBBS, Topeka, Kans.:

Every business house occupied by from 10 to 15 saloons under non-enforcement of the prohibitory law now occupied by legitimate mercantile business; new business houses built and none vacant. Rents have advanced materially. Public expense of sustaining poor families reduced one-fourth or more. Percentage of crime reduced materially and cost of policing city diminished proportionately. My judgment is the people of Fort Scott would vote 3 to 1 against opening saloons here after being without them and their revenue.

W. F. BROOKS, Mayor.

EMPORIA, KANS., March 17, 1910.

W. R. STUBBS,
Governor State of Kansas, Topeka, Kans.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your message of March 11, 1910, will say that the city of Emporia is in better shape at present than it has ever been. About 100 houses were built last season, and practically there are no vacant houses in town at present, rents are as high as they have ever been, and when residence property changes hands it brings nearer what it cost to build than it ever has. There is very little crime and almost no drunkenness. We do not pick up a drunk once a month. The bank deposits are at a very high state, and the people are generally prosperous. I believe that 90 per cent of the people favor prohibition and its enforcement.

Yours, truly,

FRANK MCCAIN, Mayor.

OTTAWA, KANS., March 20, 1910.

W. R. STUBBS,
Governor, Topeka, Kans.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your inquiry, will say that drunkenness has diminished 25 per cent, and I know we have at least 50 per cent less cases in police court growing out of liquor than we had before the prohibitory law was strictly enforced. While I have been an officer here for four years, I have given this question very close attention. Our people are highly in favor of the prohibitory law and its enforcement.

Yours, very truly,

F. T. BRUNER,
Chief of Police.

CONCORDIA, KANS.

W. R. STUBBS,
Governor, Topeka, Kans.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your letter of inquiry, 19th instant, as to increase or decrease of drunkenness, will say that in my 11 years' work with the sheriff's office and police force here drunkenness has decreased 75 per cent and crimes usually brought about by drink have decreased in about the same proportion. To explain: In February, 1898, our county jail had in it 11 prisoners, 7 charged with felony. During the three years and four months which I had charge of the jail, beginning at above date, the average number confined therein was 5, since which time the average has fallen to 1, the jail being empty one-half the time. In 1899 the average Saturday sales of booze, as reported by the

three joint keepers, was \$150 each, or \$450 by all of them. It is safe to say that sales by drug stores and other sources amounted to \$50 more.

BELOIT, KANS., March 20, 1910.

Hon. W. R. STUBBS,
Governor, Topeka, Kans.

DEAR SIR: In reply to yours of the 19th, will say that in my opinion the percentage of drunkenness and crime has decreased fully 90 per cent under the strict enforcement of the prohibition law. I have occupied the office of city marshal for the past 16 years and am therefore in a position to make a close estimate; our chief trouble here is from liquor that is shipped in by private parties.

Very respectfully, yours,

SAMUEL BANKS.

Mr. THOMPSON. As far as Kansas is concerned the question of prohibition is absolutely settled. There is no political party there which can place in its platform even a hint at a resubmission of the question and hope for success at the polls. Only two years ago a distinguished man of ability, who has many virtues and had been generally successful politically, got it into his head that a resubmission of the proposition, after 35 years, would be popular as an issue in a race for governor of the State. As you know, there are a great many people who believe that this question, like every other question, ought to be submitted to the people for their consideration at various times; and although many people believe that who would finally vote for prohibition if it was resubmitted, voted for this candidate for governor on a resubmission issue, out of a vote of 528,206, including those who simply believed in the submission of the question, as well as those who were opposed to prohibition, all the votes that could be mustered for resubmission during that campaign from every political party—and there were four or five parties in the field at that time—were 47,201, less than 9 per cent of the vote at that election.

As I said in the beginning, I want to be absolutely fair and frank and tell the whole truth about this matter. It is true that we did not have absolute prohibition in Kansas during all these years, for, greatly to our shame and chagrin, in the early existence of the law there were but few people who felt that it could be enforced strictly to the letter. It is true the saloon was put out of business, but there were many well-meaning and law-abiding people who felt that after all, perhaps, this liquor business was a necessary evil and had to exist in some form or another, and they more or less winked at a violation of the law behind closed doors, in "speak-easies," and "blind tigers," and "joints." But that day has passed. That condition existed more or less throughout the State, principally in the large cities, however, until the memorable crusade of Carrie Nation with her little hatchet along about 1900, or 15 years ago. By the forcible use of the hatchet, as you remember, she entered the barrooms operated behind closed doors and broke the mirrors and the glasses and the beer bottles and things that were in sight. She announced the doctrine that it was not unlawful to resort to unlawful means to destroy an unlawful business.

No matter how much we may criticize that doctrine, this forcible crusade brought the attention of the thinking people of Kansas to the unlawful business, those who did not have it pointed out to them before, and it then became an issue as to whether the lawless element of the State was greater than the State itself; and on that issue with the honest, earnest, and law-abiding people which I claim for the State of Kansas, you may well know the result. Instead of permitting the officials to wink at the loose enforcement of the law as in the past, they called the officers on the carpet and asked for a vigorous enforcement of the law, and against every man who failed they instituted proceedings in court and removed him from office, or waited until they got a chance at him at the polls. So we got officials in every department charged with that duty to enforce the law strictly to the letter.

For the benefit of the business men, the only men of high standing whom I have found in the city of Washington who fear prohibition for the District, claiming that it would be ruinous to the business interests of the city, that there never was a greater business mistake made in the world. We learned from actual experience that the more vigorously we enforce this law the greater was our prosperity in Kansas. They seem to forget that the many hundreds of dollars spent for liquor unnecessarily by people who can not spare it will be spent in the dry goods stores, the grocery stores, and for things of necessity which they have to offer, and that they will receive the money instead of the saloon, which has been receiving it for these many years in this city and District.

On that point I wish to call attention to the fact that after 35 years of experience with this law, Kansas, on January 1, 1916, paid the last dollar of its State indebtedness. But few

States in the Union are so well favored. When the saloon was in force our State was indebted nearly \$2,000,000, and in January last we paid the last cent of this indebtedness. Instead of being one of the poorest States in the Union financially, as formerly rated, we have gradually advanced until now we are the richest State per capita in the entire United States. We have in the banks in Kansas, I know from a recent statement of December 12, 1916, over \$290,000,000, deposited by the people of my State, being an average deposit for every man, woman, and child of over \$170. In addition to this, practically every bank in my State has an account with the banks of Kansas City, Mo., where millions of dollars go every year. It is safe to say that, including the deposits in Kansas City, Mo., belonging to the people of Kansas, we have to our credit \$500,000,000, or at least \$300 per capita—greater than can be claimed by any other State in the Union.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VARDAMAN in the chair). Will the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. THOMPSON. Certainly.

Mr. REED. The Senator referred to a bill he had introduced which was before the Judiciary Committee. I wish to ask the Senator if it is the bill entitled "An act to amend section 242?"

Mr. THOMPSON. That is, relative to labeling articles?

Mr. REED. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is one of the bills.

Mr. REED. Is that the one the Senator said I was on the subcommittee to consider?

Mr. THOMPSON. No. I think you were on the subcommittee upon the joint resolution.

Mr. REED. For a constitutional amendment?

Mr. THOMPSON. I think so.

Mr. REED. To clear it up, there never has been a subcommittee appointed.

Mr. THOMPSON. I have a letter to that effect.

Mr. REED. The joint resolution the Senator introduced is identical with a joint resolution that was introduced by some half dozen other Senators. There was never a subcommittee appointed on the Senator's joint resolution.

Mr. THOMPSON. I am not charging any dereliction of duty to the Senator or making any insinuation against him.

Mr. REED. The Senator said I was holding up his bill, and his statement ought to be now withdrawn.

Mr. THOMPSON. I withdraw the insinuation, Mr. President, if there was such. I did not mean to say anything to the discredit of the Senator from Missouri in any way. I am glad to know that he is favorable to the bill to which he has called my attention, for I know I will have his help now.

Mr. REED. I have not committed myself to your bill. I said that I was favorable to the principle.

Mr. THOMPSON. I will be glad to have the Senator's help on the subcommittee. I shall try to get him appointed on the subcommittee.

Mr. REED. I thank the Senator, but I suppose the Judiciary Committee will be able to attend to that, and I shall not need the Senator's distinguished and able assistance; but—

Mr. THOMPSON. The Senator is more fortunate than I am. I do need his assistance to get this bill out of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. REED. The Senator will allow me to finish my sentence.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did the Senator find my resolution for national prohibition while he was searching around the committee?

Mr. REED. I found your resolution for an amendment of the Constitution prohibiting the sale of liquor. That is the one that was introduced December 10, 1915, over a year ago, and no subcommittee has been appointed on that, evidently for the reason that it is identical with some five or six, or perhaps more, resolutions introduced by other Senators, and upon some of which subcommittees were appointed. However, on none of those am I a member of a subcommittee. So that I may not be misunderstood, I will state that I am favorable to the proposition of stopping the shipment of liquor into dry territory to be disposed of contrary to and in violation of the laws of that dry territory. That may and may not be a very different thing from saying that I am for the Senator's particular proposition, because I have not examined that particular proposition, and I do not know just what it is.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. THOMPSON. Gladly.

Mr. CLARK. In the absence of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in order to clear up the situation a little at least, it may be proper to say that the Judiciary Committee has not been neglecting the various bills to which the Senator has referred, but, on the contrary, has given the whole subject matter careful and studious attention from time to time. I will say to the Senator now that a special meeting of that committee has been called for the present week to consider this identical subject and no other. So it shows that at least the Judiciary Committee is exhibiting some activity along the line.

Mr. THOMPSON. I thank the Senator for his suggestion that progress is being made in the consideration of this matter by the committee. I am very glad indeed to know it. If I have said anything which indicates that the committee has been derelict in its duty in any way, I will withdraw that statement gladly.

I am glad to know that I have the cooperation of the distinguished Senator from Missouri in a matter which is vital to my State, and I hope that he will be a member of any subcommittee that will have consideration of that bill.

Now, Mr. President, I have extended these remarks longer than I anticipated when I took the floor. I have called attention to a great many things in a financial way simply to answer the charges which are made that economically prohibition is a failure, for I think I can safely say that measured by dollars and cents it is the best investment that the people of Kansas have ever made. If I were to be asked the question what law we are more firmly wedded to than all others upon our statute books—I am speaking now of those things which are malum prohibitum, that are made crimes by law—I would unhesitatingly answer the prohibitory liquor law, for I believe it will be the last one, if it comes to repealing of laws, that our people would give up.

Dollars and cents do not mark the greatest benefit. It is true that nowadays almost everything is measured in dollars and cents; if it pays, then it is said to be a good thing; if it does not pay, it is not a good thing; but I believe, after all, the greatest benefit of prohibition to my State is the fact that we have over a half million boys and girls in the State who have never seen a saloon, or at least have never had an opportunity to visit one. I hope they never will. We have now "dry" territory to the west of us and to the south of us, and, thank Heaven, Nebraska to the north of us just recently voted for prohibition; Missouri is fast falling in line, and we hope that before many years pass we shall not be surrounded by any of what are termed "wet States."

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. THOMPSON. I yield.

Mr. OWEN. I merely wish to suggest to the Senator from Kansas that the prohibition States now extend from Texas to Canada.

Mr. THOMPSON. I am glad to have the suggestion of the Senator from Oklahoma. When Missouri is included we shall all be satisfied.

If I were asked what law has been the greatest educational benefit to my State, I would have to answer the prohibitory liquor law. When that law went into effect the illiteracy of the State was 49 per cent. It has decreased since that time to less than 2 per cent—the lowest of any State in the Union, excepting one.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. How many years—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators must address the Chair before interrupting a speaker. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. THOMPSON. I do.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. How many years has the prohibition law of Kansas been in effect?

Mr. THOMPSON. For about 36 years. We expend annually \$12,000,000 for educational purposes. We now have 27,000 pupils in our own colleges.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator from Kansas if I heard him aright—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. THOMPSON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. REED. Did the Senator from Kansas state that before the prohibitory law was passed in Kansas the illiteracy was 49 per cent?

Mr. THOMPSON. My understanding is that prior to 1880 the illiteracy was 49 per cent.

Mr. REED. Oh, there never was a community in America which was so ignorant as that—not even in Kansas.

Mr. THOMPSON. That may be; but that is my understanding of the records. I have seen the statement printed at various times, and the books published by the Antisaloon League give this figure. I am glad now to say that at the present time the illiteracy is less than 2 per cent. If I have made a mistake in my statement, I shall be glad to correct it if the Senator from Missouri will call my attention to it. I have, however, seen that statement in various statistics and in various publications and speeches which have been made upon this subject, and have used it with the understanding that it was admitted to be correct. I do know that we have now 27,000 students in the colleges of our own State, which is the largest college attendance in proportion to population in the Union. The statistics show that there are 54 counties without an idiot, 87 counties without an insane inmate, and 96 counties without an habitual drunkard. Tell me that prohibition does not prohibit—with 96 out of 105 counties without an inebriate or an habitual drunkard. I regret to say that the few drunkards we have are along the borders of Missouri and Nebraska, and now there will not long be many on the Nebraska side and I hope there will not long be many on the Missouri side.

Then, as to our health, if I may boast of that, we have the lowest death rate of any State in the Union— $7\frac{1}{2}$ per 1,000 annually.

Mr. REED. I want to ask the Senator a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. THOMPSON. I yield.

Mr. REED. I want to ask the Senator how he knows that? I notice, in looking through the Statistical Abstract, that Kansas does not even report to the Federal Government as to its vital statistics. It is one of the two or three States that evidently have no vital statistics.

Mr. THOMPSON. It probably had no deaths.

Mr. REED. It is impossible that such a blessing as that should have fallen upon the country, that all Kansans should live forever.

Mr. THOMPSON. Some live longer than they ought to, perhaps.

Mr. REED. That is a fact which is generally admitted outside of Kansas.

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, sir; but I am reliably informed by those who make the statistics that they were so astonished that they checked up two or three different times to ascertain whether or not that was really true. Of course, that might not be considered by some people as worthy of consideration, but I think it is. While other things may have contributed to all these good results, it is fair to say that prohibition has done something toward that end.

Mr. President, in closing I wish simply to say that in a country like this, that is acknowledged to be the greatest and richest country in the world, with the greatest natural resources of any country, where there is a single man, woman, or child anywhere under the Stars and Stripes suffering for the necessities of life, there must be something wrong somewhere. I wish, sir, simply to offer the suggestion that if the hundreds of millions of dollars that are unnecessarily expended every year for intoxicating liquor were devoted to useful purposes, the time would come when there would not be suffering anywhere, and those who are now homeless and suffering for the necessities of life would have plenty. If we eradicate the liquor traffic not only in the District of Columbia, but in the Nation, we shall have struck down the greatest enemy to the country and the worst enemy to humanity, and will have taken the longest step that we have ever taken toward bringing about comfort, prosperity, patriotism, and happiness everywhere.

Mr. REED and Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I shall take only a moment. I do not intend to discuss the prohibition question. I asked the Senator from Kansas in rather a jocular spirit this morning if it were not true that beer and whisky were regularly delivered in the city of Kansas City, Kans., openly at the present time?

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator submit to a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. The Senator's question involved the further statement that it was knowingly done and with the consent of some official authority?

Mr. REED. Well, I do not care to cavil about the form of the question. The Senator has made that the occasion of a sort of attempted diatribe about Missouri and Missouri people, and he has had some very loosely constructed figures and statements introduced into the Record. I think that there is no looser statement than the one he made about his own State, that before the prohibitory law was passed in Kansas, which was only a few years ago, the degree of illiteracy was 49 per cent; that is to say, that nearly one-half of the population could not read or write. Of course, that is not possible. There never was a State in the Union populated by white people, as Kansas is, where any such lamentable condition as that existed. So also the statement that the degree of illiteracy is now the lowest of any State in the Union is equally loose and needs careful revision.

However, I do not stand here to attack the State of Kansas. Her schools are good schools; her colleges and universities are good colleges and universities. As long as I have known of Kansas intimately this has been true, and I have known of Kansas, through living in the immediate neighborhood, for nearly 30 years.

I do not know what effect the prohibitory law may have had in Kansas as a whole, but I want to say to the Senator that no man can candidly claim that there was any real enforcement of that prohibitory law for many, many years after it was passed. I remember a good many years ago trying a case in a court, which was presided over by the Senator's distinguished father, I think, in a small town in Kansas.

Mr. THOMPSON. Hiawatha.

Mr. REED. At Hiawatha. It seemed to me that there was not a lawyer at the bar who was not a common drunkard, and they had prohibition there, but it did not prohibit.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. The Senator will acquit me of that. He knows I had not been admitted to the bar at that time. That was in 1891, when I first became acquainted with the Senator from Missouri, and we have been good friends ever since.

Mr. REED. The Senator was not at that time a lawyer, and I am stating this to cast no aspersions upon the Senator's State or town. I had a good deal of business for a good many years in Kansas, and I say now, without desiring to reflect upon the Senator's State, that there were more drunkards to the square acre in Kansas than in any place I ever was, and that, too, under a prohibitory law.

Mr. THOMPSON. Would the Senator object to stating how many years ago that was?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. REED. My travels back and forth there—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. REED. Oh, no; I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON. The time to which the Senator refers was 25 years ago, was it not?

Mr. REED. Oh, no; not that far back. Formerly I frequently had legal business in the State of Kansas.

Mr. OWEN. May I suggest—

Mr. REED. I will ask the Senator to wait until I have concluded this sentence. That business dropped off very largely something like 12 or 15 years ago, and I have not been there very much since. I am going to state this case fairly before I get through, so that I do not think the Senator from Kansas can object to it; but the facts ought to be stated. Did the Senator from Oklahoma desire to ask me something?

Mr. OWEN. I merely desired to remove the doubt as to whether the period referred to by the Senator from Kansas, when the Senator from Missouri was practicing law in Kansas, was 45 years ago or 55 years ago?

Mr. REED. Well, hardly that long ago. It was about the period when the Senator from Oklahoma was rising to national fame; and I presume that is not more than 20 years back.

I only know from reading the press that up to very recently—and, I think, up to the present time—liquor was regularly delivered in the largest city of Kansas by the breweries of Missouri or elsewhere from house to house, just as it was delivered in Kansas City, Mo.; and the press have stated that it was by agreement and arrangement, and that there was to be no interference with it. I think, however, to state it fairly, it was claimed that this was done in interstate commerce and was within the law, the liquor being transported across the State line. But we can not escape the conclusion that there were people there still drinking it or they would not have been buying it.

Now, since the Senator has had occasion to refer to Missouri as though it were some dark and benighted spot existing just outside the golden sunshine that glorifies Kansas—

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. REED. When I finish the sentence. I desire to offer a few observations on that question. I now yield to the Senator.

Mr. THOMPSON. I hope the Senator will acquit me of making any charge against the good people of the State of Missouri. I have made none. I have the very highest admiration for the people of Missouri generally. A great many of them, especially in Kansas City, Mo., went there from Kansas. The only charge I have made is against the brewery interests of that State as the only ones who have given us any trouble in the enforcement of our prohibitory law. They are the only people I have referred to as the element that comes across and helps to violate the laws of the State and then get back home unharmed.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, there are two elements that cross the State line. There is the brewery agent from Missouri with his load of beer going to Kansas to sell drinks, and there is a large, constant, and never-decreasing stream of Kansans coming across from Kansas to Missouri to get a drink. It is mutual. They have the thirst over there, and there are a few institutions in Missouri that have the wherewithal to satisfy their thirst.

Mr. THOMPSON. Does not the Senator think it rather hard to keep tempting us in that way all these years? Why not put down the business?

Mr. REED. "Tempting us!"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators will not interrupt a Senator when he is speaking without permission from the Chair.

Mr. REED. Interruptions are entirely agreeable to me. "Tempting us!" Poor children, without sufficient stamina or manhood so that they can maintain themselves in the face of temptation.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, we have been able to take care of ourselves fairly well regardless of the temptation.

Mr. REED. Tempting a Kansan! Leading a Kansan astray! Why, out in that State the Kansas fellow jumps up and kicks his heels together three times before he alights, and declares that he is "the bad man from Bitter Creek," and that he knows more and can do more than any other individual on God's earth. He ought not to be whining around about temptation. They are a smart and a capable people, a very independent people, a people very hard to manage; but the cold truth about the situation ought to be told. I have not the figures, but they are sending into Kansas to-day, not alone from Missouri but from every point in the United States where liquor is made, liquor in astounding quantities, and it is being sent there to be drunk up, and it is consumed; and I will make the assertion now that you will find as many drunken men in any city in Kansas as you will find in any city of the same size in Illinois, in Arkansas, in New York, or in Missouri. When the Senator says there are 90 counties in his State in which there is not a drunkard that is like his figures of 49 per cent of illiteracy before prohibition took effect.

The Senator's State has not become purer and better than other places. I recall that when we drove the public gambling houses—I hope the Senator will wait to hear this—out of Missouri, they took refuge in Kansas City, Kans., and ran openly in violation of the law for over 15 years and flourished as the green bay tree, and sent their agents to sell their lottery tickets surreptitiously across the State line. Virtue may make its home in Kansas, but it is not the exclusive inhabitant of that delightful territory.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, if the Senator wants to tell all about it, he certainly is free to admit that that condition does not exist in Kansas City, Kans., now. We are enforcing the law there. The gambler and the saloon go together, hand in hand.

Mr. REED. No.

Mr. THOMPSON. And when we do away with the saloon we are through with the gambler.

Mr. REED. Until about five or six years ago, or perhaps seven years ago, they had innumerable whisky and beer joints in Kansas City, Kans. They openly defied the law in the city of Leavenworth. The hotel bars and saloons were as open there as they were in the State of Missouri, and drunkenness was a very prevalent disease, or habit, or whatever it is called. Five or six years back they elected a man attorney general of the State who undertook to enforce these laws. He had a desperate time in accomplishing his undertaking, but he prosecuted the "joints." The open saloon, I think, he absolutely eradicated. Finally the law was so enforced that open gambling

was stopped, and I think they have a very fair condition of public and private morals in the State of Kansas; but they have as much drunkenness, in my opinion, in that State to-day as they have in the State of Missouri, and I think a little more.

The Senator has spoken about Missouri. I have always been a believer in the doctrine, first, that you can not successfully enforce any law unless the moral sentiment of the community is back of it, and that the only way to get good results is to create the moral sentiment and then enact the law. I may or may not be mistaken in that view. Accordingly, however, I have been a believer in the doctrine of local option, because when the people of a local community really desire to expel the saloon and are back of a law which they themselves helped to enact it has nearly always been proved that the law can be enforced.

There is another reason, which I do not urge in favor of the saloon but which I simply state as a fact: That a saloon in a small neighborhood may be a very much greater nuisance than it would be in the business district of a large city, because it more immediately affects the life and the comfort and peace of the small community. Those two considerations, taken together, have convinced many people who, like myself, are opposed to intemperance and would like to see the day when there is not a single victim of intemperance on the earth that the best way to get results is to proceed along the line of permitting local communities to prohibit the sale of liquor within their borders; and proceeding upon that line the temperance forces have been able in my State to have local option adopted in all but a very few of the counties except where there are large cities, and even in those counties the parts outside of the cities have been voted dry. Thus these people are able to protect themselves against what they consider an evil. When you come to the question of the city, I am in favor of the city exercising exactly the same right. When it has exercised it, then its mandate ought to be obeyed.

The difference is one of viewpoint. One man, having succeeded in carrying prohibition in his community, thinks that it is his duty to carry it to the State. Other men think it is then their duty to force their views and opinions upon the people of other States. It has invariably happened when this is done that evil has resulted. The prohibitory law in Kansas undoubtedly was enacted before there was a sufficient sentiment to support it, and accordingly they had an intolerable, a fearful condition in Kansas for many years. When public opinion overtook the law, then they had, as they have now, quite a different condition. How long it will continue I can not say; perhaps always.

But the Senator from Kansas must not overlook the fact that Kansas can not be taken as an example for all parts of the country, and for the very patent reason that Kansas is absolutely an agricultural State. The largest city in Kansas does not exceed forty to forty-five thousand in population.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, those figures should be corrected, I think. Wichita has some sixty-five to seventy thousand, and Kansas City, Kans., 100,000. The Senator remembers that.

Mr. REED. I think the Senator is correct and that I have understated the population of those cities. I was thinking of Topeka as the largest town. Kansas City, Kans., is larger than Topeka, and Wichita is larger than the capital, Topeka. The probabilities are that the largest city in Kansas has approximately 100,000 people, but the State is essentially an agricultural State, and a good State. The conditions there, however, and the conditions that exist in a State like that represented by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE], or the State of New York, are different. The conditions that obtain in Kansas are not the conditions that obtain in the District of Columbia.

I am perfectly willing to let the people of the District of Columbia or the city of Washington vote upon this proposition, and if they vote for it let it be enacted into a law. But no greater mistake was ever made, in my judgment, in any moral movement, than to undertake to drive it along at such a rate that public sentiment is arrayed against it. Always there ought to be care taken not to addle the egg in your haste to hatch it.

The Senator has spoken about the morality of Kansas, the schools of Kansas, and the money of Kansas. Comparisons are odious, but Kansas is not a whit ahead of Nebraska, not a whit.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. The Senator is aware that Nebraska has just passed favorably on State-wide prohibition.

Mr. REED. Exactly; but I am talking about conditions. The fact that Nebraska on the 7th day of November passed a

prohibitory law has nothing to do with its previous condition. That law has not been in force, if indeed it is in force to-day. I do not think it is in force. They still have open saloons. So I am comparing this wet State with the State of Kansas, and I say that in every respect it will rank favorably with Kansas, and that is no reflection upon Kansas. But the fact that I state points the fallacy of arguments that attribute a condition to one cause when it is the result of thousands of causes.

So, too, the State of Kansas is not one whit ahead of the State of Missouri, which the Senator seemed to speak of with such contempt. Nay, it is not comparable with the State of Missouri in many respects. Its morals are no better and not so good. Its credits are not so sound nor so well taken. Its courts do not stand so high. Comparisons are odious. The State of Kansas is no better in any one of these respects to which the Senator has called attention than the great State of Texas, neither has her increase in population or wealth been so rapid as that of the great State of Texas. Her women are no better looking, and her men no braver and no more patriotic.

All these questions ought to be settled according to the facts and not according to the excited imagination of men who attribute everything on earth to one reason.

If I were asked to tell the principal reason for the prosperity of Kansas, I would have no difficulty in citing the reason and in proving it. The State of Kansas, of course, to begin with, was populated by ordinary American citizens, except a few extraordinary ones who went there under the excitement of a great international contest which was impending. They settled upon these great prairies; they had many years of adversity; they had droughts; they had bad crops; they had grasshoppers; and they had other troubles which fell upon them through no fault of the people. But for some reason or other God Almighty has sent generous rains to the State of Kansas for the past 10 or 12 years.

The arid region has been shrinking up and the agricultural region has been extended farther and farther to the west until to-day and for the last 10 or 12 years at least the Kansas farmer has been practically sure of his crops. Those great fields of corn have stretched away until they touch the horizon's brim and their golden wheat fields wave in the sun and have brought to the farmer bounteous results. Just in proportion to the wheat and corn crop of Kansas has Kansas prospered. Whenever she has had a bad crop she has had hard times. Whenever she has had a good crop she has had good times. Her people have been frugal and industrious and improved the happy conditions which God Almighty has sent to Kansas, and they are prosperous to-day.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. REED. In a moment. I am not so ungenerous as to take away from God Almighty His share of credit for prosperity in Kansas.

Mr. THOMPSON. The Senator will then admit, even after all this argument, it was water after all that helped out our people, not liquor?

Mr. REED. Yes; water helped you out. I do not say that liquor ever did you any good. I have always thought the worst combination on earth was a Kansan and a quart of Bourbon. It seemed to me he never did know how to take a drink.

Mr. THOMPSON. We never had sufficient experience.

Mr. REED. He had a thirst that apparently was like the thirst of the earth in the arid counties of the West; it could not be satisfied. It drinks all that falls upon it and opens its mouth and cries for more. If there ever was a place on the earth where they did need to regulate the habits of the people it was in Kansas.

Now, the State of Oklahoma has always had a kind of prohibition, legal prohibition. It has more drugs than any other place except Kansas that I know of, but Oklahoma does not owe its prosperity to that. Before I leave Oklahoma let me not be understood to reflect upon that State. To my mind it is the magic State of the Union. It does have some people who drink liquor and prohibition does not seem to have stopped it. That is all that I am intimating. But Oklahoma had some years of wonderful prosperity. Then she had some years of very hard times. Apparently this last year business and enterprise have again revived. Seek for its cause. Just as long as Oklahoma had enough rain and had big crops her granaries were filled; when the railroad trains were bearing the wealth that had been produced by her soil to the East and bringing back gold to Oklahoma she had prosperity. Just the minute the heavens looked down cloudless and the vault re-

sembled a sheet of blue steel, the sun burned into the soil, vegetation shriveled, and Oklahoma had bad times. It was not prohibition; it was rain, or lack of rain; it was weather. Yet I do not claim that this settles the question against prohibition. But let us talk about these things as they are.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. LANE. I have enjoyed listening to the discussion by the Senator from Missouri in his reference to Kansas. Missouri was always on the back of Kansas. That was the case in the early history of that Territory in the old days of John Brown and Jim Lane, who was a very distant relative of mine. Kansas had to bear with them or fight them.

But as to the experience of States which have gone dry, and I say it in all seriousness without any joking, in the State of Oregon conditions are far better on the average with the people for the reason of its having gone dry. The men who had spent their money for liquor, who burned up their wages on Saturday nights in barrooms, took it home when the State went dry and bought shoes for the little children who had formerly almost gone barefoot, took home food for their wives to eat and clothing for them to wear.

The merchants in every county throughout the State state freely that their bills are better paid and that they do more legitimate business and have less trouble to collect their bills than they did when we had the license system of selling liquor. There is no doubt of it.

It rains in the western part of Oregon regularly every year. There is an average of 44 inches, plenty of it, and in some places we have to put in tiling to get rid of it, so weather has nothing to do with it; the result has been as an economic improvement. There is not a doubt in the world that the people are more prosperous and the communities throughout the State and the wives and children and the little homes are better off because the State is "dry."

Mr. STONE. When did the State of Oregon go dry?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to his colleague?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. LANE. We had local option. It has been going dry for about 10 years.

Mr. STONE. I say the State.

Mr. LANE. Several years ago; about four years ago.

Mr. STONE. I was in the State a year ago last summer and in Portland I saw open saloons at the hotels.

Mr. LANE. There was an exception in favor of hotels at one time, but the barrooms have been closed now.

Mr. STONE. These were barrooms.

Mr. LANE. In hotels?

Mr. STONE. Yes, sir; they are the only ones I saw.

Mr. LANE. We had a law in Oregon which permitted saloons to run at full blast. That was changed at the election two years ago, and if the Senator—

Mr. STONE. I am not entering into any controversy; I was asking for information, for it was only a little over a year ago when I was in Oregon, and in browsing about in the great and beautiful city of Portland I happened to observe that there were saloons. I did not think anything about it; I just supposed it was common there, as it was in other places; but I saw them; in fact, I peeped into one or two of them just to see what was going on.

Mr. LANE. Last year?

Mr. STONE. Last year. Let me see, I want to be accurate about it. It was the year of the World's Fair at San Francisco.

Mr. LANE. That was last year. The Senator then did better than even the officers of the law, for the State was dry then. No saloons were in existence.

Mr. STONE. There were friends of the Senator and men who have a right to be present in the Senate Chamber who accompanied me on one or two occasions. I am giving no names, but that is what occurred. Those saloons were there. If they were there a year ago or a little more, and the Senator says now that everybody is happier and more prosperous and doing better, and I am not disputing it, I am just wondering how in so short a time my friend, the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon, being here, spending his time in Washington, attending with great assiduity and value to his country to the services imposed upon him, would know just how many people were paying their debts, more or less, than they did before, and all that sort of thing.

Mr. LANE. Now, Mr. President, the State went dry—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the junior Senator from Missouri yield further to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. REED. I yielded for a question. I did not want to lose the floor. The Senator has occupied some time, but I do not want to deny him the privilege of concluding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Missouri yields further to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. LANE. After the genial and whole-souled remarks of my esteemed friend, the senior Senator from Missouri, I will say that the State went dry in 1916. This is the end of the year 1916.

Mr. REED. Let me ask the Senator when the law went into effect.

Mr. LANE. In 1916.

Mr. REED. How soon after the election?

Mr. LANE. It went into effect immediately following the passage of the law. The next year, 1915, then—

Mr. REED. So there has been only one year for this prosperity to spring up.

Mr. LANE. Prosperity did not spring up, but the result was the paying of debts to merchants. I had that information from them directly, from the larger merchants of the city of Portland and reports from other portions of the State. In 1916 the State went what they call bone dry; that is, something after the manner of the bill introduced by the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot]. Prior to that time anyone could import 2 quarts of whisky each month and a certain amount of beer, I do not know how much. So if the Senator was there during the year 1915 and he was procuring whisky, he was entitled to import a couple of quarts, I suppose; but there were no saloons.

Mr. REED. The Senator ought to quote my colleague accurately. He did not say that he procured liquor; he said he saw open bars.

Mr. LANE. If he saw open barrooms they were conducted contrary to law, for it is against the law.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. With the permission of the junior Senator from Missouri, I should like to offer an amendment to the pending bill and have it printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. REED. I really desire to conclude my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri declines to be further interrupted.

Mr. REED. No; I do not want to take the Senator from Oregon off the floor, but I want to admonish him that I should like to conclude.

The Senator from Kansas said that the prohibition law worked so well in Kansas there was not a single idiot or insane person in some of the counties of the State. That is another remarkable statement. Wild statements of that kind do no good. They have had prohibition in Kansas, I have forgotten how long, but I think for 20 years.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. The Senator from Kansas said for 30 years.

Mr. REED. Here is the Statistical Abstract the United States Government puts out giving the number to the 100,000 of population who are in insane hospitals, which, of course, does not include all the insane. I notice that in Kansas there are 88.4, whereas in the wicked State of Florida there are only 51.6. In the State of Georgia, which up to the time these statistics were prepared was a wide-open State, there were only 81.1. In the State of Idaho, which was not dry until long after this book was printed, 74.4. In the State of Indiana, 82; the State of Louisiana, 54; the State of Mississippi, 52.9; the State of Nebraska, 60.6; the State of Texas, 46.7; Tennessee, 45; South Dakota, 57; South Carolina, 57; Utah, 59; and Wyoming, 37.9, to 100,000 of population.

Of course, the Senator from Kansas would say that figures do not lie, but liars figure. But liars are not confined to those who figure. Here are the official tables prepared by the United States Government. If they be not true, I do not know where we would go for our authority. Now, all this is to the point that the question which is now before the Senate ought to be settled just according to its merits. I would be the last man on the floor of the Senate to claim that drinking liquor is a benefit to a man, to claim that the saloon is a moral institution, to assert that whisky or beer is an essential to civilization and progress; but, on the other hand, it would be equally wrong and it is equally wrong for men to affirm that all ills humanity suffers from grow out of this one thing. People are in the habit of finding a scapegoat. Old Adam blamed it on the woman. "The

woman beguiled me and I did eat." If Adam had been a prohibitionist in his day and wanted to prohibit women circulating in the Garden of Eden, if that had been his theory, he would have proven his case conclusively by his charge against Eve. And yet the fact is old Adam would never have eaten the apple if he had not had the old Adam in him. It was the weakness of the man, not the generosity of the woman, that caused Adam to put his teeth into the forbidden fruit.

Every man who has committed crime almost invariably looks around to find somebody or something to blame it on. One man blamed it upon fast horses, forgetting that the horse was not to blame, but that it was only his foolish self when he went to the race track and bet his money on the wrong horse. It was a defect of his own judgment and his own morals, not the horse that was to blame. Another man blames his downfall to cards, but the cards were inanimate things; they could do no man harm. But a poor, weak, miserable individual could take those inanimate things and employ them to his own harm. He was to blame, not the cards. Another man looking around for an excuse for his own evil deeds or shortcomings or failures charges it to liquor. Yet the real culprit was the man himself.

The truth is that the reason why these various causes for human downfall are assigned is that some human being wants an excuse for his own weakness, and if you were to take these various causes away—not in all cases, but in many cases—the individual will develop some other defect.

Nevertheless, while I state that side of the case I frankly say that many a man might have gone through the world and not ruined himself financially if it had not been for the fast horse, and it may have been an argument to take the fast horse away from the man who would not ruin himself in order to protect the poor, weak fellow who does. And so it is with liquor. There may be a sound and logical argument for taking it away, abolishing it, in order that men who have these weaknesses shall be protected, but it is utterly a mistake to assume that all the ill there is in this world can be charged to any one of these causes.

So, in my own humble judgment, recognizing liquor as a thing that is frequently used by people in a way to injure themselves, recognizing the right, whenever the moral sentiment of a community is in favor of its abolition, of that community to be permitted to abolish the evil, and believing that no law can be adequately and properly enforced unless there be a moral sentiment back of it, I have always adhered to the doctrine of letting the people express the opinion of the community to which they belong; and then if the people determine in favor of prohibition, let it be prohibition. Let it not be any of these miserable makeshifts for prohibition. Let it not be a law that permits two quarts to be sent to a man every month, and which will allow that individual to get outside of the two quarts all at once and get drunk in his own home and break up the furniture and beat his wife. That sort of drinking, to my mind, may be worse than drinking in a saloon.

Neither let it be the miserable makeshift of this bill which I have already spoken of, a makeshift bill that permits alcohol to be made in unlimited quantities within the District of Columbia and shipped to any part of the United States, with a pretended limitation which I have undertaken in other remarks to demonstrate will amount to nothing, a limitation to the effect that the alcohol shall not be sold to be used as a beverage, when everyone knows that alcohol is never employed as a beverage. So the limitation amounts to nothing, and the alcohol can be sold and employed as a raw material in making whiskies or any other kinds of liquors that people do use as a beverage.

I believe, sir, in the doctrine that a community has the right to express its opinion, and then I believe in the doctrine of protecting that community. I do not think that it has the right to say to the people of the State of Idaho or Colorado, represented by my two distinguished friends who I see opposite me, you have the right to prohibit the sale and use of liquors within your State, and then under a Federal law to practically nullify the laws of those States by permitting the liquor to be shipped in there contrary to the laws the people of those States enact.

Now, we have been progressing in this country very splendidly along the lines of temperance and sobriety every year, as witness the advance of the movement. There are many men and many women who have devoted their lives to the great propaganda of temperance who believe that hasty and inconsiderate action may be in the end detrimental to the cause.

I have taken very much more time than I expected to take. I really rose simply to call the attention of the Senator from Kansas to the fact that he was getting on rather dangerous ground in employing his time in abusing the States lying around about him.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I wish to make a few comments upon the proposed amendment of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] to Senate bill 1082, proposing a substitute therefor. The substitute in effect is a referendum to a certain number of classified voters in the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, I have for many years strongly favored the initiative and referendum as a policy of government, of permitting the people of the various States by initiative petition to initiate the laws they do want, and by referendum permitting them to have the right to exercise a veto on laws which they do not want, which have been passed by their Representatives in the legislative branch. The purpose of the initiative and referendum, broadly, is to make more representative our representative Government and to compel those who appear as the representatives of the people to really and in truth represent the people.

In this case the Congress of the United States is representing the people of the United States in declaring a policy with regard to a small tract of land, less than 10 miles square, on which the Capital of the Nation is located. The people of the United States, who are represented by Senators on this floor, have voted with regard to the question of prohibition in 2,543 counties, and there remain only 355 counties where intoxicants are yet permitted to be sold.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma restate those figures?

Mr. OWEN. There are 2,543 counties in the United States which have voted on the question of prohibition, and only 355 counties remain; and the 355 counties include Utah and Florida, which recently upon the question of prohibition elected State legislatures and State governors overwhelmingly committed to the policy of prohibition. All of the Southern States now, except Louisiana and Texas in part, are committed absolutely to prohibition, and very much the larger part of Texas is committed to it.

I call attention to this, because the Senate of the United States in its representative capacity ought in good faith, I think, to recognize as a national policy the declaration of nine-tenths of the people of the United States.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. OWEN. I yield.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from Oklahoma gave us the comparison by counties. In my State we have never taken a vote on this subject by counties, but we take it by what are termed in New England towns and cities. Aside from three or four of the cities, almost the entire State of New Hampshire has voted "no license." So that action would add something to the force of the Senator's argument.

Mr. OWEN. It would add to the force of my observation; but out of 48 States, here are all except 11 States—37 States of this Union—which have declared in favor of the policy of prohibition. If the Senate of the United States desire to represent the will of the people of the United States, they are bound to establish prohibition at the National Capital, just as the Senate found it necessary to do so within the confines of the Senate and as the House of Representatives found it necessary to do so in the confines of the House of Representatives.

The proposal to refer this matter to a referendum I regard as unfriendly to the act. It is proposed by one who, as I understand, is unfriendly to the act. This referendum, if it were permitted, would leave the voter subject to the use of money corruptly by the liquor interests of the surrounding territory, which is now domiciled within the confines of this city.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. OWEN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KENYON. If there should be a referendum at all on this subject along the lines of the Senator's argument, should it not be a referendum to the people of the entire Nation?

Mr. OWEN. I think it should be a referendum to the people of the entire Nation, because the District of Columbia is the seat of the government of the people of the United States. I feel that the people of the United States have given an imperative mandate to the Senate of the United States in this matter, and I shall govern myself accordingly.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. OWEN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have hurriedly examined this proposed substitute. I find that in several instances the language is used "the qualified voters of said precinct." Does the Senator from Oklahoma know how we are going to ascertain who are the qualified voters of the District of Columbia?

Mr. OWEN. There are no such qualified voters. The act itself must state the qualifications, and make them qualified voters before they will come within the description of "qualified voters."

Mr. GALLINGER. But I do not find any such designation in the proposed substitute.

Mr. TOWNSEND. That is found in the second section of the proposed substitute.

Mr. GALLINGER. Then, perhaps I am mistaken about that. Oh, yes; I have found the language to which the Senator from Michigan refers.

Mr. OWEN. I am opposed, Mr. President, to the referendum for the reasons which I have stated. They are controlling with me and, therefore, I do not deal with the details.

Mr. GALLINGER. There is a qualification in section 2 of the proposed substitute which is rather a loose one, but it is better than none. Now, I want to ask the Senator from Oklahoma, who has taken great interest in securing a corrupt-practices act for the country, if there is anything in our statutes which would prevent the use of money in elections in the District of Columbia?

Mr. OWEN. In my judgment there is no adequate protection. The law of conspiracy, which might prevail, will not be available if an individual does not appear in conspiracy with others. The law of conspiracy therefore is no adequate protection.

Mr. GALLINGER. Of course we in New England know that when we have attempted to get "no license" legislation how freely money has poured in from Boston and New York from men who were engaged in the liquor traffic. It seems to me that the District of Columbia would be peculiarly subject to that bad influence if this matter were submitted to the people here for their ratification.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I fully agree with what the Senator from New Hampshire says in that respect. I would go further, and say that where we have 37 States of this Union committed to prohibition, and their efforts to carry out their laws are nullified by the corrupt practices of individuals remaining in this traffic in the States which have not yet prohibited it, the Congress of the United States ought to cooperate with the 37 States, and make it a criminal offense to transport across the State line of a prohibition State any liquor from the nonprohibition States.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. If Congress has the power to do so.

Mr. OWEN. Congress has the power to do so; and it ought to exercise it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the State which I in part represent in this body enacted a prohibition amendment to its constitution in 1914, to become effective on the 1st day of January, 1916. It has therefore been in operation nearly 12 months. Of course that is a comparatively short period of time upon which to base a permanent impression of the good or evil involved in its operation, but it is perhaps sufficiently long to justify me in laying before the Senate some of the results, not perhaps of prohibition, but for the period in which it has been effective, upon the material and moral condition of the Commonwealth.

I was much impressed not only during that but in previous campaigns for prohibition with some of the practical arguments or assertions that were made in opposition to it. Consequently I cast my vote against the amendment. Had it been an amendment confined strictly to the abolition of the saloon, I would without question have supported it, but I felt that it would be well for us, inasmuch as we had adopted some other experiments in legislation in advance of the experiences of other States, prudence required that we wait and see the effect of the practical operation of prohibition in States which had preceded us in adopting it before finally crystalizing it into our own constitution.

Some of those arguments or assertions, Mr. President—and perhaps I should call them "assertions" rather than "arguments"; "predictions" possibly might be a still better term—were that prohibition would result in a general business depression in all lines of commercial and industrial activity; that it would result in throwing thousands of people out of work and leaving many of the store and business buildings of our large cities vacant, practically creating an atmosphere of surrounding depression that would not be at all conducive to our growth or to our well-being with tourists and travelers; that the drinking of liquor bore no relation to crime; and that there would be

more crime and more arrests for crime under prohibition than under license.

To that was added the assertion that the revenues necessary for the transaction of the State's affairs and for the payment of the expenses of local administration would be largely reduced as a result of prohibition, thus requiring an increase in our rates of direct taxation in order to meet the disbursements necessary in the discharge of public business.

Whatever else may be said, Mr. President—and there were some other assertions—I think enough has occurred to justify the conviction that none of the prophecies to which I have called specific attention have materialized in practice. On the contrary, the development of the State during the year 1916 in all the elements of material and moral growth and well-being practically stands without precedent in our previous history.

This may be, and probably is, largely due to the prevailing prosperity, and therefore founded, of course, upon other conditions than prohibition. It may be also largely due to an indirect consequence of the war, by means of which easterners are beginning to visit and become familiar with their own country, not through preference but through necessity, because the tourist travel in the Rocky Mountain region last year outdistances and outclasses all previous records, and indicates that the people of the United States will derive one unexpected benefit from the holocaust in Europe, and that is a more intimate and familiar acquaintance with the beauties, the attractions, and the wonders of their own Republic.

There has been no general business depression in Colorado since prohibition went into effect; on the contrary, as I have stated, we have enjoyed more prosperity, and wider extended and more widely diffused prosperity, than we have ever known. That is verified in many ways; for example, by the weekly reports of Dun and Bradstreet on every line of business, by the bank clearings in the city of Denver, which is the metropolis of the State, and which have practically doubled, and by the unprecedented industrial activities throughout the State.

We have practically no empty stores in Denver. The places which were hitherto devoted to the liquor business have either been converted into places of legitimate amusement and recreation, where what are called "soft drinks" are sold or other lines of business have been substituted for them. After an absence of some 10 or 11 months from my home, I observed, upon returning last October, that there were fewer unoccupied buildings in the business part of the city than when I left my home in November of 1915; that the crowds upon the streets seemed to have increased; that the hotel lobbies were as full, if not more full than ever, of both transients and citizens; and that the general round of activities was quite as satisfying and quite as promising as before. Of course these observations might not in themselves be convincing since the conditions might be the result of transient causes of which, as a virtual stranger, I had no knowledge.

Now, one of the side arguments, so to speak, or assertions which was made in the campaign of the "wets," in 1914, was that without the opportunity of purchasing stimulants of all kinds everywhere, the tourist traffic, which is very considerable in our country, would practically disappear. It was argued that unless the average visitor coming to the State could secure intoxicants at his own sweet will he would instead of coming to Colorado go elsewhere, and that, as a consequence, we would drive away from the State a very desirable influx of travelers, carrying with it the revenues which always attend upon their incursions. That has not only not been verified by events, but, as I stated a few moments ago, the tourist traffic of the State has not only doubled but has virtually quadrupled within the last 11 or 12 months, and all of the beneficent results of that character of travel have been multiplied in proportion.

Regarding the question of its effect upon the people, I may say that of those who opposed prohibition in 1914 I think I am within bounds when I affirm that 60 per cent of them would to-day, if the question were again presented for consideration, vote for, instead of against, prohibition. Mr. President, the prohibition wave which has swept over this country during the past few years has as its actuating cause not the moral but the material aspect of the question. Of the immorality of excesses in strong drink there never was much question; there can hardly be said to be two sides to the proposition; but the advocates of prohibition, upon humanitarian grounds, have beaten their wings against the doors of the opposition for years in the vain effort to break them down, and it was only when the materially beneficial effect of abstinence became apparent from its practical operation that a majority of the public ranged itself upon the side of prohibition.

The question was before my State a number of times before it finally succeeded. Formerly the material and practical benefit of prohibition was scarcely emphasized; or, if so, the argument did not command approval. We had, as the country remembers, and as we have occasion bitterly to regret, a widely extended industrial strike in Colorado in 1913-14. The coal camps, as they were called, were in insurrection, and the southern part of the State virtually, therefore, was in a condition of actual warfare. One of the first acts of the governor, after taking possession of the so-called infected districts, was to close all the saloons in the coal counties and to keep them closed by the strong arm of military power. Notwithstanding the industrial turmoil, which menaced law and order in every direction, the beneficial effect of that order upon the industrial classes, upon the commercial classes, upon the women and the children in those coal camps and in the cities—I was about to say more than offset the losses and the horrors of the strike itself, but that perhaps would be going too far. It unquestionably, however, minimized them very materially, and directed the attention of the industrial interests of the State to the practical business benefits and industrial improvements consequent upon the close of the saloon. Hence the employers and the great employing companies, prompted by purely selfish business considerations of the tremendous advantages of the new over the old régime, joined the ranks of the prohibitionists, and carried their cause to success in 1915; and the local benefits so apparent in these so-called infected counties, producing this accession to the ranks of the prohibitionists, seems to have justified the application of prohibition to the entire State.

Now, I do not wish to be misunderstood. I draw a distinction between "prohibition," as the term is used, and that "dry condition," which is supposed to be its equivalent. The two things, to my mind, are entirely dissimilar. Colorado is prohibition; it is not dry; and no State will be dry or can be dry so long as prohibition laws and constitutional amendments contain exceptions, through the gates of which liquor can be introduced and consumed as a beverage; indeed, I do not believe, if those gates were wholly closed, until the appetite and characteristics of mankind shall have profoundly changed that there can be such a thing as the successful prohibition to the individual of the use of intoxicants. But the prime outstanding beneficial feature of prohibition in Colorado is the abolition of the saloon, an institution that is a curse to any community, State, and Nation, particularly when it is practically without restriction, as it generally is through the political power which it always wields. It is a trap for the unwary; it leads the unthinking and the youthful into indiscretions and induces habits and companionships which are apt to prove destructive. They are an unmitigated curse in every particular to the communities where it exists. So that the abolition of the saloon, or, if you please, the driving of it from the ground floor, is an incalculable benefit wherever prohibition effects that consequence. When the saloon, if it exists at all, must take refuge behind closed doors, and in second or third stories or in basements; it may be pernicious, but the injurious consequences of its existence are largely minimized by reason of the fact that it is no longer public and no longer immediately accessible.

Politicians are always prone to indorse those things which seem to be successful or the indorsement of which may lead to success. That may, Mr. President, be an ambiguous compliment to the politician, but it is human nature nevertheless, and a phase of human nature, the operation of which we recognize everywhere, not excepting legislation in the Senate of the United States. The fact that prohibition is practically successful in my State is perhaps emphasized as strongly as in any other way by the circumstance that both the great parties in 1916, for the first time in our political history, unequivocally indorsed the proposition. They did so because an amendment to the constitution was then proposed, declaring beer not to be an intoxicant in the meaning of the prohibition clause of the constitution, the object, of course, being apparent; that is to say, to exempt beer and all malt liquors from the prohibitive effect of the amendment. That proposed modification was repudiated by both the great parties and rejected by the people by a majority, as I recall, of about 85,000. If it is true that in politics we recognize and act upon the thing which leads to success, the highest possible tribute that can be paid to the result of prohibition in the State from which I hail is shown and reflected in the action of the two great political parties of the State.

Of course, in the great cities there is always a larger proportion of antiprohibitionists than are found in the rural and remote districts. I think that may be accepted as a generally true statement, except in mining communities. Hence the city of Denver, like other great cities, was at all times the State

stronghold of the "wets." Whenever the prohibition question was submitted to a vote of the people its opponents could confidently rely upon the overwhelming adverse majority of cities like Denver and Pueblo, whatever the result in the outside counties might be. This is reflected in the vote of Denver since 1910, at which time that city voted "wet" by a majority of 17,000, in 1912 by 22,000, in 1914 by 8,500, in 1915, upon a so-called home-rule amendment, by 3,500; but in 1916 the majority vote of the city and county of Denver against the so-called "wet" amendment was 10,960. In the State the majority against prohibition in 1912 was 40,000; the majority for the amendment in 1914 was 11,500; the majority for prohibition in 1916 was 85,789.

Mr. President, I can perhaps summarize what I have to say regarding specific evidences of benefit to our State, and thereby impose myself for a briefer space of time upon the Senate, by quoting from an article upon the subject published in one of the papers of my city during the present month, the 12th day of December, and which is the summary of what I am told was a careful ascertainment of the actual facts, so that they could be properly and truthfully presented for consideration. I give these statistics by reading directly into the Record the statement of the paper itself:

Taxes have decreased.

Finances of the municipality never were so good.

The license taxes which the city of Denver relied upon very largely for its revenues, and which, I think, constituted far more than one-third of its actual revenues, of course now have to be supplied elsewhere, and they have come from two directions—partly in the increase of taxation through the raising of rates, but more largely through the decrease of expenses, consequent perhaps upon other reasons than prohibition, but due, nevertheless, to something, and coincident with the period of time during which prohibition has been in effect.

Business is better than it ever has been.

There is a sign in my city over the entrance to one of the most extravagantly decorated saloons of the old era. It reads: "Buy shoes instead of booze." It is filled with a stock of shoes. None of the ornamental fixtures had been removed, and they were crowded with merchandise, which attracts by the novelty of its display.

Every man who wants work can get it.

There are fewer vacant houses and stores than ever before.

Building permits, especially for the last six months, show a decided gain, particularly in the matter of small homes.

Collections are 40 per cent better.

Savings accounts in Denver banks have broken all records.

Hotels, whose proprietors predicted they would be driven out of business within three months, are planning extensions, and two new million-dollar hostleries are assured within a year.

Divorce suits filed show a decrease of 40 per cent.

Arrests, for all causes—

Of course this is within the city—

Have decreased 31 per cent.

Arrests for drunkenness have decreased 59 per cent.

Arrests for vagrancy have decreased 55 per cent.

The cost of maintaining the city jail has decreased 28 per cent.

The cost of maintaining the county jail has fallen 27 per cent.

The number of murders, suicides, and burglaries has fallen off at an astonishing rate. There have been only two murders in Denver in 1916.

Prior to that time, Mr. President, the number of tragedies of that sort occurring in my city was far greater than I would care to acknowledge.

One of these was so clearly a case of self-defense against a demented man that the jury reached a verdict of not guilty in less than 20 minutes. The other case has not come to trial. At least a dozen murders a year formerly was Denver's average.

Police Chief Hamilton Armstrong says crime is decreasing at a phenomenal rate. He attributes this to prohibition.

District Attorney John A. Rush stated in open court recently that the work of his office has decreased 50 per cent since the city went dry.

Every newspaper in Denver has cut its staff of police reporters from one-half to two-thirds.

NOT SO MANY PRISONERS.

The State penitentiary has one-fourth fewer prisoners than formerly, and about February 1 will close one whole wing of its chain of buildings.

Then follow statistics showing that some 317 persons have been arrested for what is popularly known as "bootlegging."

It is said that an attempt has been made to discredit these figures, and that the corrections have been sent broadcast throughout the United States in bulletins—

In which official reports of Frederick R. Knight, police court clerk, were so cleverly garbled that the casual reader got the impression arrests for drunkenness had increased heavily under prohibition.

Just before Denver went dry saloon interests predicted that property occupied by saloons would remain vacant, as the locations were fit for nothing but saloons; that saloon men, brewery workers, and others dependent upon the liquor trade would move away from Colorado, causing houses to become empty and real estate values to depreciate; that ice plants, which were supposed to rely upon the saloons as their best customers, would reduce their output at least 50 per cent, consequently laying off many workmen; that merchants in every line would

encounter the worst times in the history of the city; that taxes would be heavily increased to make up the loss of the \$341,000 annually paid by saloons in licenses.

Then follows a statement of what has actually happened, to which I have already adverted, but which I think will perhaps bear repetition:

The best of the saloon locations were rented even before the bars moved out. Proprietors of other businesses had their fixtures built in advance; saloons closed and moved out Saturday night; new concerns installed fixtures and stock Sunday, and opened for business Monday.

Merchants in all lines are commenting on the increased business during 1916. Their customers pay their bills promptly, they say. Denver is not a manufacturing city and therefore is not affected by any abnormal increase in business that can be attributed to the war.

Nearly every big merchant tells of accounts owing so long he had "written them off the books"; since the saloons closed the men who owed these bills have drifted, unsolicited, into the stores and commenced to pay up on the installment plan.

The Denver Gas & Electric Light Co., which serves as something of a barometer for financial conditions in the city, reports its collections are 40 per cent better since prohibition.

While at home I discussed this subject, Mr. President, with several leading business men of my city whom I knew to be opposed to prohibition in 1914. With one exception, all these gentlemen informed me that they had been agreeably disappointed as to the practical results of prohibition in the city and county of Denver; that their business had increased; that payments were made more regularly and more promptly; and one of them emphasized the fact that the accounts in the savings banks had practically doubled in number, and, if I remember rightly, in amount as well.

As a man who once opposed prohibition, and who feared that some of the evil consequences predicted of its adoption might be verified, I am obliged in the face of these conditions to announce a change of view, and assert that if the experiences of my own State for this short time are a standard, instead of injuring in any way—materially, morally, industrially, or economically, even temporarily—the interests of a great city, its progress and its growth, those interests and progress and growth will be accelerated, and accelerated along lines that must commend themselves to every man who believes that civilization, comfort, and prosperity are essential to human happiness.

Mr. President, I do not pretend to believe that prohibition or any other change as the result of legislation can bring about that perfection in human affairs for which we should all strive, but which we can never hope to reach. I do not regard it as a panacea for all human ills, nor, as I have said, as something which will expel the drink habit from the habitations of mankind. But that the abolition of the saloon is one of the things which from a moral and practical standpoint is desirable I believe is established and demonstrated not alone by the experiences to which I have adverted in my own State but by those of every other State where the system has been tried.

I confess to much sympathy with that view which protests against legislation that must result in confiscating the goods of others which have been acquired for the prosecution of a business recognized and encouraged by the law. In other words, while the business of saloon keeping and the manufacturing of liquors is not the highest occupation in the world, while it is one that justly incurs the reproach of our people, we must recognize that it is and has been a legitimate calling, one which has been not only tolerated but encouraged by legislation and by communities; one for which there has been a demand, and which is one of the justifications for its existence. It is not right, it is not just, it is not fair, it is not American, to adopt a system of laws which, going into immediate effect, must necessarily result in the virtual confiscation of the goods of the saloon keeper. I do not think that is right.

That condition was met in my State by providing for a postponement of the time when the prohibition amendment should become operative. It was enacted in November of 1914. It went into effect on the 1st of January, 1916, giving 13 months to all those possessed of property, of leaseholds, or other acquisitions essential to the carrying on of the business either to dispose of them or to convert their occupations into other pursuits. I have no doubt that some injustice was done there, that some confiscation or destruction of property values resulted. I know that immediately after the amendment went into effect the bartenders and those previously employed in the breweries had a mass meeting in the city of Denver. They appointed committees to wait upon the governor and to demand employment as compensation for the jobs that had been taken away from them. I sympathized with that movement very largely. I felt, and I still feel, that there was upon the State a duty—a moral duty, at least—of looking after and doing something for these unfortunates. Nothing was done, however. Time passed. The movement disappeared. It resolved itself into nothingness, and the conclusion which I necessarily drew was that the demand for labor at that time was so active and so widespread that no

necessity existed requiring the State to make extraordinary efforts in the way of securing other lines of employment for these people.

Mr. President, I have detained the Senate longer than I intended, but I felt that it might help to clarify the situation here to give some of the brief experiences of my State, and particularly of my city, under the active operation of prohibition, as an offset to the same assertions, the same arguments, and the same predictions which are being advanced here as the result of the establishment of a similar condition of affairs in the Nation's Capital.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have here an article that I clipped from the New York Herald of December 17, showing whither we are drifting if we adopt the prohibition amendment. It refers to the city of Boston, which has an election to-day, I believe, on this question. I desire to send this to the desk and ask to have the Secretary read it. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. THOMPSON] a little while ago stated how business prospered under prohibition in his State. I want to give to the Senate an evidence of the judgment of the Boston people; and I am assured that the gentleman whose name is mentioned therein is a gentleman of the highest type and character. I conferred with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] as to his standing in the community, and he said it was par excellence.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator desires this read from the desk as a part of his remarks?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Yes; I should like to have it read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

[From the New York Herald of Dec. 17, 1916.]

REAL ESTATE MEN JOIN IN LIQUOR FIGHT IN BOSTON—ASSERT \$10,000,000 YEARLY RENTALS ENDANGERED BY "DRY" CAMPAIGN.

BOSTON, MASS.

Real estate owners have joined with the liquor interests in the fight to keep Boston from voting its saloons out of existence on Tuesday. Circulars calling upon them to work for license have been sent to all members of the Real Estate Exchange by the president of the organization, Mr. Francis R. Bangs, and it is known that many wealthy real estate men have contributed liberally to the already large fund that has been raised by the brewers and liquor dealers.

"Your directors feel that it is their duty to call your attention to a grave danger that threatens the real estate interests in Boston," Mr. Bangs says in his circular.

"It is a critical situation, for the reason that a few thousand votes might turn the scale either way," he warned, and asserted that \$10,000,000 in gross rentals will be endangered if the city goes dry.

"Large amounts of capital employed in the liquor business would be rendered useless, wasted, or withdrawn. More than 10,000 people would be thrown out of employment, and not only put to great hardships themselves, but their landlords and all other persons with whom they deal would suffer.

"Apart from the foregoing considerations, which primarily affect real estate," the circular concluded, "it is obvious that great damage would be done to general business and to the standing of the city in relation to other cities of equal size if Boston should be put in the list of no-license municipalities."

Most of the Boston newspapers have been editorially urging the retention of licensed saloons, and thousands of circulars are being sent among the voters by the liquor advocates. The liquor dealers in large front-page advertisements in the Boston newspapers also denied responsibility for vicious attacks on the Rev. "Billy" Sunday that have appeared in a recently established newspaper and in circulars sent all over the city.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I beg to say further that Senators proclaim in loud terms and tones as to the results of prohibition in their States. I have noted here the fact that in the case of Topeka, Kans., as I stated this morning, the statistics show that in the month of September, 1913, 90,062 gallons of liquor were imported into that city. It has a population of about 40,000.

In Portland, Me., in the year 1913 the arrests for drunkenness were 4,006.

In the city of Greensboro, N. C., a prohibition State, 5,279 gallons of liquor were imported in December, 1913, being 195 gallons per day.

In the case of Tennessee I have not the figures.

I state further that I have gathered from the statistics that these dry, prohibition States are not the El Dorado of the world. Prohibition has not brought all peace, nor all happiness, nor all quiet. Prohibition has not prevented crime, but crime goes on just the same.

The number of persons in penal institutions in the State of Maine in the year 1913 was 5,252; in Iowa, 13,108; in Kansas, 3,878; in Virginia, 12,534; in West Virginia, 6,033; in Georgia, 12,981; in Texas, 10,399; in Arizona, a dry State, 6,841; in Washington, 10,198; and in Oregon, 6,431.

The percentage per 100,000 of persons committed to penal institutions in the wet State of New York was 502; in New Jersey, a wet State, 402; in Delaware, half dry and half wet, 983; in

South Carolina, dry, 498; in Tennessee, dry, 456; in Texas, dry, 267; in Florida, half wet and half dry, 1,312; in Alabama, 412; in Montana, that was pictured here in such glowing terms the other day, 3,348; in Arizona, 3,348; in Utah, 481; in Oregon, 956; and in Colorado, of which the Senator has just spoken, 609.

It seems to me that these figures very seriously and flatly contradict the statements that have been made by our friends on the prohibition side.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. In connection with the article with reference to the city of Boston, that city is to-day voting on the question—

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I realize that. I so stated.

Mr. GALLINGER. Boston is to-day voting on the question as to whether or not it shall be a so-called "dry" or "wet" city—

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Yes, sir.

Mr. GALLINGER. Terms that I think are absurd to use in this connection. I will ask the Senator if he thinks it was a very valuable contribution to this discussion to put in the RECORD the fact that the liquor interests and the owners of real estate where the saloons are located have raised a large fund for the purpose of influencing the action of the—

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I will ask the Senator—

Mr. GALLINGER. I hope the Senator will let me finish the sentence—for the purpose of influencing the action of men who are supposed to be able to formulate a correct judgment on public questions?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I will answer the Senator. I presented that, as I stated, in contradiction to the statement of the Senator, who declared that business interests and all had been promoted. I introduced these figures to show the very fact therein stated, that the business interests would be very seriously detrimented and deterred. I stated, furthermore, in connection with my remarks that I had consulted with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] as to the character and stability and truthfulness of the gentleman whose name was presented—I have forgotten now what it was—and the Senator from Massachusetts assured me that he was a gentleman of the highest character.

Mr. GALLINGER. Oh, I have no doubt of that.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. In answer to the Senator's final proposition as to whether there was money raised to defend these men and the business in which they were directly and financially interested, I do not question it. No man does question it. Neither will the Senator deny the fact that the prohibitionists have raised large sums of money to press their theory and their claims.

Mr. GALLINGER. I never—

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. There is no more evil on one side than evil on the other.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator has knowledge as to the prohibitionists raising money to corrupt the franchise, I know of no such instance.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I do not say "corrupt"; neither can the Senator say that this is corrupt.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is the only way they could do it, inasmuch as the election occurs to-day, and this dispatch is only a few days old. That is what they raised the money for, just as they do everywhere, and the Senator knows it.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Well, that is very nice as a broad and general assertion without any proof. There is no doubt money is raised. In every election that I have ever known of since I was 18 years old there has been money raised. God knows that the Senator from the State of New Hampshire, as a member of the great Republican Party, can not here with good grace cry out against the raising of money. You have flooded the country with money for all sorts of propaganda that was dominated over by your Republican creed; and in the last controversy—

Mr. GALLINGER. I have not flooded anybody with money. I have not had money to flood anybody with.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Well, I was not talking of the Senator. I have a very kindly regard for the Senator. Aside from a few of his idiosyncrasies, I think he is one of the most lovable persons in the world. [Laughter.]

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, Mr. President, the matter of idiosyncrasies must answer for itself.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I have no qualification, I will say to the Senator—

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator will not allow me to utter a sentence. I asked the Senator once before to restrain his impetuosity. Once I had to appeal to the Presiding Officer to

protect me from the Senator as he approached my desk with outstretched arm. [Laughter.]

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Whatever I might have done in the past, my impetuosity at least has been harmless to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. There is something like 60 feet between us, and there is nothing but wind to-day intervening. [Laughter in the galleries.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair must admonish the occupants of the galleries that if there is any disorder he will order them cleared.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator is always entertaining, and sometimes is amusing, and he never disturbs me in the least degree, notwithstanding his aggressiveness and his apparent desire to pick a quarrel with somebody. [Laughter.]

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Oh, never!

Mr. GALLINGER. Now, Mr. President, the Senator may take his seat just for a moment, if he pleases.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. The Senator will hear you, but he will not take his seat until he has yielded the floor.

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, the Senator can do just what he pleases about that.

Mr. President, the Senator has presented to this body something with which most Americans are familiar, and that is the fact that whenever the attempt is made to regulate the liquor traffic—even to regulate it—the liquor dealers raise an immense sum of money for the purpose of preventing the legislation of which they do not approve.

In the letter that came from Boston, signed by a reputable gentleman, the Senator says—I do not know who it was—it is stated that a large loss is to accrue in rentals; that is, the rentals of buildings to the liquor sellers of Boston. Those gentlemen strike hands with the liquor dealers to raise large sums of money to control the election that is taking place to-day in Boston. That is a fact that I wanted to have appear in the Record as a fact. We will see what the result will be. Very likely, with the aid of a large sum of money, Boston will remain in what is called the wet column. I presume that will be the fact, although I hope it will not; but it will go down into history that this fund was raised for the purpose of influencing the votes of the people as it shall be expressed at the polls to-day in that great city.

Mr. BORAH obtained the floor.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I want to answer the statement made by the Senator from New Hampshire directed to myself.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Let me say just a few words, and then I will yield the floor.

Mr. BORAH. Very well.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. The Senator from New Hampshire charges that I am desirous of trying to pick a quarrel. Those were his words. God knows no man in this body dislikes to quarrel more than I do. That is just contrary to my whole disposition. Heaven knows the Senator from New Hampshire is the last man I would like to quarrel with. I have no desire to quarrel with anybody.

Mr. GALLINGER. That was not said seriously on my part. I said the Senator appeared to desire it.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Oh, I would appear in the wrong rôle. My heart is not in it. I am not quarrelsome, but I do answer that it is very plain that those who are raising money are doing it in a legitimate effort to prevent the destruction of their business. On the other side, I say without fear of contradiction, and I think the Senator is too practical a politician in all these years not to know it, that prohibitionists have raised money to press their propaganda, whatever the question might be. I am pressing this. I am in earnest in everything I do. That which I like I love and that which I dislike I hate, and I am very positive and prompt in saying so.

But my controversy is not with any individual. My controversy is not with the Senator from New Hampshire or the Senator from Texas or the Senator from Kansas, but my controversy is with the proposition that is being proposed here, and that is interference with personal rights and personal liberties. The great progress this country has made has been upon a broader line, a broader base, a broader and more American system, and I hold that this proposition is narrow, contemptible, and un-American. I say that advisedly. The Senator speaks of Colorado. I do not know how earnestly Colorado has become a prohibition State. It was not so the last time I was there. I desire to say to you that it was very open on the

street corners, and so it was in very many other places, and so it was in Georgia, and so it was in South Carolina.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I should like to ask the Senator if he ever found a place that was prohibition against him.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I am not more specious in my plea nor better looking than the distinguished Senator who represents Georgia, but just as an ordinary citizen, under the hospitality of a public domicile owned by the Senator from Georgia, I am told, I saw it floating freely.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I had intended to submit some remarks upon the amendment which is proposed by the Senator from Alabama, but I understand that there is a possibility of getting a vote, and if a vote can be arranged for and the debate would only be continued through my efforts, I desire to submit the question, as far as I am concerned, without taking up the time of the Senate. In other words, if the Senate is ready to vote so as to dispose of this matter this afternoon, I should like to have a vote taken.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. As far as I am concerned, I would not like to put off the vote until late this afternoon because a great many Senators would be away. If the Senator from Texas is willing to have the vote taken on my amendment now, I am willing to have the roll called.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Let us do that.

Mr. BORAH. A great many Senators want to get away for the holidays, and that is the reason why I made the suggestion.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Two or three amendments have been introduced to this amendment and they have not yet been voted on. I suppose they will be first in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending amendment is that offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the substitute of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to ask the Senator from Kansas [Mr. THOMPSON] if he intends to offer his amendments to the original bill. I have on my desk copies of the two amendments that he presented to the Senate and asked to have printed. I wish to know of him whether he is going to offer them or not.

Mr. THOMPSON. I wish to offer an amendment to the original bill and also an amendment to the substitute. As I understand it, the amendment can be offered now to the substitute, as the original bill is a part of the substitute.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course under the rule the original bill is to be perfected before amendments are offered to the substitute. I understood that the bill itself had been perfected, but before any other amendments were offered I wanted to ask the Senator from Kansas whether he intended to offer his amendment to the bill.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not want to offer it, but I understand that I can offer the amendment to the substitute because it contains the original bill.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognized the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and understands that the exchange of views on the subject of a vote has been going on while he has the floor. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. BORAH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HUGHES. I was just going to submit a unanimous request that we vote on the Underwood amendment. That is what the Senator wants to vote on and what everybody wants to vote on, and I ask that we vote upon it at 4 o'clock.

Mr. BORAH. That is perfectly satisfactory to me.

Mr. HUGHES. We do not need a roll call for that agreement, because it is a vote on the amendment. If we can have unanimous consent to take the vote on it, we will get that much out of the way.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] has an amendment pending to the Underwood amendment.

Mr. HUGHES. It will be offered and voted upon in the meantime, I will say to the Senator, and that will bring us to a vote speedily on the substitute.

Mr. BORAH. I am perfectly willing to yield the floor for the purpose of proceeding with a vote upon the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama. If the debate is to cease, as I said, I do not want to be instrumental in continuing it. Then, as soon as that vote is taken, we can proceed to vote upon the amendment of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I hope that course will be adopted.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Mississippi that as there are some Senators in the Office Building who probably would want to vote, would it not be well to make the point of no quorum so that they can be called in.

Mr. HUGHES. May we have unanimous consent to vote immediately upon the appearance of a quorum on the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. We do not have to call for a quorum.

Mr. HUGHES. We do not have to call for a quorum in order to get unanimous consent to vote on an amendment, but that is required simply for an agreement to vote on a bill. If we get unanimous consent to vote on the amendment, we will have made that much progress. My experience is that after a quorum is called we do not make any progress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair did not understand whether the Senator from Alabama suggested the absence of a quorum or made a suggestion to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am willing to agree, if the Senator from Mississippi desires to make a request for a quorum, that as soon as a quorum appears his amendment shall be voted on. But that is of course within the power of the Senator from Mississippi. I do not care to make the point of no quorum myself.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I have desired to express my opposition to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama, occupying not over 10 minutes in my statement. I have been waiting for some time. I shall not take over 10 minutes and perhaps not over 5 minutes.

Mr. HUGHES. Does the Senator want to include that in the unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I made that statement before unanimous consent was asked for. I would be glad to see a vote taken at 4 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Georgia for 10 minutes?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I will not ask the Senator to do that.

Mr. VARDAMAN. With the consent of the Senator from Idaho, I will say if the discussion is to be opened again why not fix a definite time for voting on the bill, say at half past 5 o'clock, or not later than half past 5 o'clock to-day? There are other Senators, not myself, who wish to say something, but will forego that in order to bring about a vote. If the Senator from Georgia speaks, other Senators may be drawn into the discussion. We are very anxious to dispose of the matter this afternoon, and if it can be generally agreed that we shall vote at 5 o'clock we can dispose of it.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi if he means to vote on the bill and all amendments this afternoon?

Mr. VARDAMAN. Yes; that is what I want.

Mr. KENYON. I am in the same position as the Senator from Mississippi. I wanted to speak on the bill, but I am perfectly willing to waive it if we can take a vote on the amendments and on the bill and dispose of it this afternoon.

Mr. VARDAMAN. All I desire is to fix an hour at which we may vote on amendments and on the bill. I do not care to go to the trouble of having the roll called if it can be understood by the Senate that we will vote, say, at half past 4 or 5 o'clock.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, and I think this will suit everybody, that not later than 5.30 the Senate shall proceed to vote upon the substitute and all amendments to the substitute and then upon all amendments to the bill and upon the bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. THOMAS. Would not that require under the rule a roll call?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It does.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I want to say that some Senators who are in favor of the substitute have to leave the Chamber at half past 5 this evening who will be here in the morning. If we can have an immediate vote, I am willing; but if not, I am willing to agree to a time to-morrow—1 o'clock or 2 o'clock—at such an hour to-morrow as can be agreed upon; but I am not willing to agree to vote at half past 5 o'clock this evening; I can not agree to half past 4 o'clock, when I know there would be some Senators absent who are here now.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I ask unanimous consent that we vote immediately.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have no objection to that.

Mr. HUGHES. There is where we are. We can not vote on the amendment of the Senator from Alabama until after we

vote on the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi. I have asked unanimous consent to have the vote taken, which can be agreed to without a roll call, that we proceed to vote immediately on the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi. We can then ask for consent to vote immediately on the amendment of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If the Senator from Texas asks for an immediate vote I will withdraw my purpose to make some remarks in opposition to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama and consent to the immediate vote.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan and others. Regular order!

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands the request of the Senator from New Jersey to be that the Senate agree to an immediate vote upon the pending amendment, and that agreement can be made without a roll call.

Mr. JONES. That would not prevent the offering of an additional amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It would not. Is there objection to an immediate vote being taken on the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the substitute proposed by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]? The Chair hears none.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Let the amendment be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, line 8, strike out the word "male." On page 2, line 14, after the word "election," insert "and who can read and write and who have paid all taxes and assessments due from them and unpaid by them to the Federal Government and the government of the District of Columbia," so that the section will read:

SEC. 2. That all resident citizens of the District of Columbia who are over the age of 21 years, of sound mind, and have not been convicted of an offense involving moral turpitude, and who have been residents of the District of Columbia and the voting precinct in which they reside for more than one year prior to the date of the holding of said election, and who can read and write and who have paid all taxes and assessments due from them and unpaid by them to the Federal Government and the government of the District of Columbia, shall constitute the qualified voters at said election. The managers of the said election shall be the sole judges of the qualifications of the voters.

Mr. HARDWICK. I raise a point of order that the question ought to be divided, it involving two separate and distinct propositions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thinks the point is well taken.

Mr. HARDWICK. I request that it be divided, then.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It contains undoubtedly two propositions. The question then is on the first amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. GALLINGER. Which is?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state it.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, line 8, strike out the word "male."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. On that question, in order that absentees may be notified and may be here, I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Let the amendment be stated again.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The roll call has been begun, the Chair will state.

Mr. PENROSE and others. Regular order!

The Secretary resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL], who is absent. If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. CLAPP (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS]. Not knowing how he would vote and not being able to obtain a transfer, I am constrained to withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN]. The Senator from New York has left a memorandum stating that he is against the bill itself and in favor of the Underwood referendum. I am for the bill and against the referendum, but I do not know how the Senator from New York would vote on the amendment pending, so I withhold my vote.

Mr. MCLEAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS]. On this question I am at liberty to vote, and I vote "yea."

Mr. OVERMAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], and vote "nay."

Mr. OVERMAN (when Mr. SIMMONS's name was called). I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. SIMMONS] is absent on account of illness and that he is paired with the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD].

Mr. CHILTON (when the name of Mr. SMITH of South Carolina was called). The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is absent on account of illness in his family. He asked me to state to the Senate that upon this proposition he is in favor of the referendum, but wants it confined to male whites of the District of Columbia. I do not know how to pair him or transfer his pair on the question.

Mr. THOMAS (when Mr. SHAFROTH's name was called). My colleague [Mr. SHAFROTH] if present on this amendment would vote "yea."

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I wish to give my reason for my vote.

Mr. GALLINGER. Not now.

Mr. TILLMAN. Not now, but in a few minutes. I vote "yea."

Mr. WALSH (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] which I transfer to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CLARK. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] who is absent. I therefore withhold my vote. If he were present and I at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. CURTIS. I was requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON];

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA];

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH]; and

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CATRON] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN].

Mr. DILLINGHAM (after having voted in the affirmative). I have already voted, but I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH]. I wish to say that I am relieved from the obligations of the pair on this question, and I therefore allow my vote to stand.

Mr. CLAPP. Since my name was called I have been relieved of my pair and I now desire to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. CATRON (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN]. As he has not voted and does not seem to be present, I withdraw my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 15, as follows:

YEAS—54.

Ashurst	Hollis	Nelson	Sterling
Borah	Hughes	Norris	Sutherland
Brady	Husting	Oliver	Thomas
Chamberlain	Johnson, Me.	Page	Thompson
Clapp	Johnson, S. Dak.	Penrose	Tillman
Colt	Jones	Pittman	Townsend
Cummins	Kenyon	Polindexter	Vardaman
Curtis	Kern	Pomerene	Walsh
Dillingham	Kirby	Saulsbury	Warren
Fernald	La Follette	Sheppard	Watson
Gore	Lane	Sherman	Williams
Gronna	Lee, Md.	Smith, Ariz.	Works
Harding	McCumber	Smith, Mich.	
Hitchcock	McLean	Smoot	

NAYS—15.

Bankhead	Culberson	James	Swanson
Beckham	du Pont	Martin, Va.	Underwood
Brandeggee	Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Wadsworth
Bryan	Hardwick	Overman	

NOT VOTING—27.

Broussard	Lea, Tenn.	Owen	Simmons
Catron	Lewis	Phelan	Smith, Ga.
Chilton	Lippitt	Ransdell	Smith, Md.
Clark	Lodge	Reed	Smith, S. C.
Fall	Myers	Robinson	Stone
Gallinger	Newlands	Shafroth	Weeks
Goff	O'Gorman	Shields	

So Mr. WILLIAMS's amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The second amendment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] will be read by the Secretary.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, line 14, after the word "election," insert:

And who can read and write, and who have paid all taxes and assessments due from them and unpaid by them to the Federal Government and the government of the District of Columbia.

Mr. JONES. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CATRON (when his name was called). I am paired generally with the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN]. If he were present, I would vote "nay" on this proposition. He being absent, I withhold my vote.

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). I make the same announcement as to my pair as I did before. If permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. CLARK (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] and withhold my vote.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] and withhold my vote.

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I repeat the fact that I am paired with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN], who is absent. For that reason I withhold my vote.

Mr. OVERMAN (when the name of Mr. SIMMONS was called). I again announce that my colleague [Mr. SIMMONS] is absent on account of illness in his family and that he is paired with the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD]. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH], and will let that transfer remain for the balance of the day. I vote "yea."

Mr. WALSH (when his name was called). I make the same announcement of the transfer of my pair as announced on the recent vote and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a memorandum which has been furnished me with reference to the attitude of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] on the Williams amendment. He desires it known that if he were here he would vote for it; that he wished to be paired in favor of the amendment. I really paired him against it, but it makes no difference unless some Senator can pair him for it.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I rise to inquire if the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] has voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. He has not.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Then I withhold my vote as I have a pair with that Senator. If I were permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 25, as follows:

YEAS—44.

Ashurst	Fletcher	Kirby	Smith, Ga.
Bankhead	Gore	Lee, Md.	Sterling
Beckham	Gronna	Martin, Va.	Sutherland
Brady	Hardwick	Newlands	Swanson
Brandeggee	Hitchcock	Norris	Thomas
Bryan	Hollis	Overman	Underwood
Chamberlain	Hughes	Pittman	Vardaman
Culberson	James	Saulsbury	Wadsworth
Cummins	Johnson, Me.	Sheppard	Walsh
du Pont	Johnson, S. Dak.	Shields	Warren
Fernald	Kern	Smith, Ariz.	Williams

NAYS—25.

Borah	Kenyon	Oliver	Thompson
Clapp	La Follette	Page	Townsend
Colt	Lane	Penrose	Watson
Curtis	McCumber	Polindexter	Works
Harding	McLean	Pomerene	
Husting	Martine, N. J.	Sherman	
Jones	Nelson	Smoot	

NOT VOTING—27.

Broussard	Goff	Owen	Smith, Md.
Catron	Lea, Tenn.	Phelan	Smith, Mich.
Chilton	Lewis	Ransdell	Smith, S. C.
Clark	Lippitt	Reed	Stone
Dillingham	Lodge	Robinson	Tillman
Fall	Myers	Shafroth	Weeks
Gallinger	O'Gorman	Simmons	

So the amendment of Mr. WILLIAMS to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk to the substitute amendment which has been proposed by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After section 37 of the substitute amendment proposed by Mr. UNDERWOOD it is proposed to insert the following four sections, to be designated, respectively, as sections 37a, 37b, 37c, and 37d:

SEC. 37a. Whoever for the purpose of influencing or controlling the vote of any person entitled to vote at such election shall pay or offer or promise to pay to any such voter any sum of money or who shall deliver or promise to deliver to such voter anything of value, or who shall promise such voter any position or office or employment of any kind, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall be fined in any sum not less than \$100 nor more than \$1,000, and imprisoned not less than 3 nor more than 12 months.

Sec. 37b. Whoever shall vote or attempt to vote more than once at such election, or whoever shall advise, counsel, or attempt in any way to induce any person to so vote more than once, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and be fined not less than \$100 nor more than \$1,000, and imprisoned not less than 3 nor more than 12 months.

Sec. 37c. Whoever shall contribute or pay out any money to be used for any purpose in connection with said election, except for printing and publishing facts and arguments relating to the same, or for the necessary expenses of public meetings called for the purpose of considering and hearing discussed the issues involved in such election, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and fined not less than \$500, to which may be added imprisonment for a period of not exceeding one year.

Sec. 37d. Any manager, clerk, or returning officer, or any other person who shall destroy, change, mutilate, or falsify any paper, record, or return required by this act to be kept or made out, or who shall do any act the effect of which will be to defeat the will of the voters of said District as expressed at said election, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and on conviction shall be fined in any sum not less than \$100 nor more than \$1,000, and be imprisoned in the District Jail or workhouse for not less than six months nor more than one year.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If I have a right to do so under the rules of the Senate, I am willing to accept that amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will rule that the Senator has a right to modify his amendment until after a vote shall have been taken upon it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then, I accept the amendment to my amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. THOMPSON. I desire to offer a slight amendment to the substitute offered by the Senator from Alabama, which I have submitted to him. My amendment to his amendment might as well be acted upon now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 5, at the end of line 4 of the substitute, it is proposed to add the following:

And shall order that all bars, saloons, and other places where intoxicating liquors are sold in the District of Columbia shall be closed on the days of elections for any of the purposes prescribed by this act.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I understand the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas is for the purpose of closing all barrooms and saloons on election day, and I am willing to accept the amendment to my amendment.

Mr. JONES. I desire to ask what the last words of the amendment—"for any of the purposes prescribed by this act"—mean?

Mr. THOMPSON. Where a vote is taken upon anything prescribed in the act.

Mr. JONES. They ought to be closed entirely.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is, for any purposes under the act.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understand the proposition of the Senator from Kansas is to close the saloons on election day, the day the vote is to be had under this act, and I am willing to agree to that.

Mr. JONES. I should like to have the words "for any of the purposes prescribed by this act" stricken out.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is entirely satisfactory to me.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Let the amendment be again stated, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will again state the amendment to the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 5, at the end of line 4 of the substitute proposed by the Senator from Alabama, it is proposed to insert:

And shall order that all bars, saloons, and other places where intoxicating liquors are sold in the District of Columbia shall be closed on the days of elections for any of the purposes prescribed by this act.

Mr. THOMPSON. I desire to modify my amendment in line 5, after the word "elections," by striking out the words "for any of the purposes prescribed by this act." The prohibition will then apply to any other election day.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I suppose it would apply to any election day in the District of Columbia. I have no objection to that, and I accept the amendment to my amendment.

Now, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, if there are no further amendments to be offered to my substitute—

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, on yesterday the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] stated that his substitute included the Sheppard bill as it was completed up to Saturday night. On Monday morning the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] offered an amendment including the words "or gift" after the words "import for sale," which was agreed to by the Senate. I notice that is left out of the Senator's substitute. The word "gift" where it appears in the bill as amended last Saturday is also left out. I ask the Senator from Alabama if he will not consent to insert in his substitute, on line 2, page 7, the words "or gift," so that the bill will contain the amendment agreed to Monday morning?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the Senator from Kansas that the amendments which I have accepted relate to the referendum which I propose. I have not attempted to change the Sheppard bill. If the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD], who

is the proponent of the original Sheppard bill, desires to place those words in the substitute I shall not object; but I have not attempted to alter, and do not propose to attempt to alter, the Sheppard bill. The amendments which I have accepted relate to the referendum.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I should like the attention of the Senator from Texas having charge of the bill. The Senator from Alabama has just stated that if the Senator from Texas is willing to have the bill amended so as to insert the words "or gift" after the words "import for sale," the same being the amendment agreed upon last Monday, that he would be satisfied to accept it, so far as he is concerned.

Mr. SHEPPARD. As I understand, only the words "or gift" are added after the words "import for sale." The words "or gift" should be added after the words "import for sale."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Texas submit that as an amendment to his bill?

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Senator has offered the amendment to the original bill.

Mr. CURTIS. I suggest to the Senator that the amendment was agreed upon yesterday morning, and I think it ought to be in the bill, as the substitute is supposed to embody the Sheppard bill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I will say that the words "import for sale or gift" have been incorporated in my bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Senator from Texas did not hear my colloquy with the Senator from Kansas. The Senator from Kansas asked me to accept an amendment, and I said to him that I disclaimed any responsibility for the original Sheppard bill, that if the friends of the bill were willing to accept the amendment as a part of the bill I was willing to accept it as a part of the substitute.

Mr. SHEPPARD. As I stated to the Senator from Kansas, I think the amendment ought to be confined to the words "import for sale or gift."

Mr. CURTIS. That is right.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am willing to accept it that far if the Senator from Texas takes the responsibility of accepting the suggestion made by the Senator from Kansas.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the proposed amendment as it is now modified.

The SECRETARY. The first amendment accepted by the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] appears on page 7, line 2, of the last print of the bill, after the words "import for sale," to insert the words "or gift."

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senator from Texas can not accept amendments without the question being submitted to the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state that this amendment was to the original bill.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I desire to say to the Senator from Texas that the amendment referred to by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] was inserted in the bill by a vote of the Senate on yesterday, and it was to the original bill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I so stated.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have accepted the amendment as indicated by the Senator from Texas. What I desire to submit is a referendum provision to the bill that he has proposed in the Senate as agreed to. I do not take the responsibility of changing the Sheppard bill, but I accept the suggestion under those conditions as a part of my substitute.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I would like to inquire what that is designed to accomplish. Would that prevent an individual from importing liquor for household use and then prohibit him from giving it to his guests?

Mr. CURTIS. It would not. It is intended to prohibit the importation of intoxicating liquors for sale or gift for beverage purposes in violation of this act.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Let me make a violent supposition and suppose the Senator from Kansas should import a case of beer from Milwaukee. Would he then be violating the law if he served it to his guests?

Mr. CURTIS. He would not, if he did not do it with intent to evade the law. [Laughter.] The Supreme Court of Kansas has passed upon that question and has held that the owner of intoxicating liquor who has purchased it in good faith has the right to give it to his guests without violating a statute similar to this.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Question!

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to say to the Senator from Alabama that in the same line, line 2, page 7, after the word "manufacture," the words "for sale or gift" should be added.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Senator is responsible for his own bill, and if he desires that change made, I will consent to it.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to section 2 of the referendum portion of the substitute. I will merely say, in a word, that there are many residents of this District who have maintained their voting residence in the States from which they come. Those persons ought to be permitted to vote on this question, and that is the purpose of the amendment which I offer.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. In section 2 it is proposed to strike out the words "resident citizens," in line 8, page 2, and to insert the word "residents"; and after the word "election," in line 14, page 2, to insert the words "whether they maintain or have maintained a voting status elsewhere or not."

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I should like to ask whether under that amendment a man may come to Washington, take up his residence here for a month, and vote at this proposed election?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Oh, no; under the bill he must have resided here 12 months. It covers the nearly 40,000 citizens of other States who are compelled to reside here by reason of the civil-service rules and their official position, and who are just as much entitled to vote on this question as resident citizens, and have more rights under the Constitution.

Mr. THOMPSON. I have a further amendment to offer.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Washington a question. In the bill as it now stands are there any property qualifications for voters or qualifications in regard to tax paying?

Mr. JONES. The amendment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], which has been adopted, does not require people to have property, but simply requires when taxes have been assessed against the property that the taxes shall be paid; that is all.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Washington a question. As I understand his amendment, it will allow men and women who now claim their residence in other States to vote here, provided they have resided here 12 months?

Mr. JONES. It entitles them to vote on this particular proposition if they have lived here for 12 months.

Mr. POMERENE. Just a moment further. Is the Senator able to state what effect voting here in the District would have on the right of a citizen of a State to vote in his own State?

Mr. JONES. I take it that, under the language which I have submitted here, it would not affect his right in his own State.

Mr. POMERENE. The right to vote in the States is controlled by the laws of those States and not by the laws of the District.

Mr. JONES. That is true.

Mr. POMERENE. So that the amendment in that behalf would not affect the residential rights of men in their own States?

Mr. JONES. I do not think it would.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. This amendment—and I have prepared and intended to offer a similar one—would simply allow Government clerks and officials in Washington who retain their citizenship at home, but who by reason of their holding office here live here and have their families here, to participate in this election relating to a municipal regulation.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will state that I believe the adoption of such an amendment would disfranchise a good many people in their home States. The question of politics arises in States and cities when men come to vote, and when a charge is made that a man has voted in the District of Columbia, I doubt very much whether he would be allowed to vote at home.

Mr. JONES. I want to suggest to the Senator that they do not have to vote if they do not want to run that risk.

Mr. GALLINGER. They do not have to vote, but they are invited to do so, and I simply wanted to point out the danger there is of disfranchising men in the several States if they vote in the District of Columbia.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, it can not possibly disfranchise them. We propose to adopt this provision in such shape as distinctly to say that they do not claim citizenship here. We strike out any claim of citizenship here and let them vote here when they are simply residents by reason of their office, retaining their citizenship at home.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have had some experience in trying to get men on voting lists in my own State, and I know how technical both parties are when perhaps a single vote will determine an election, and I say that, in my judgment, if these men vote here, they will be disfranchised in many instances.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I have the same thought in my mind as that expressed by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER]. I do not have the Ohio statute before me at the present time, but I do know that when it comes to determining the question as to whether or not a man who presents himself at the ballot box has a right to vote in his precinct in Ohio the fact as to whether or not he has voted in another State is very often determinative of his right.

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. POMERENE. And I have not any doubt but the exercise of the right to vote in this District would seriously jeopardize his right to vote in his home State.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, this provision entirely excepts the question of citizenship. Furthermore, this is really a Federal question, and any citizen of the United States ought to be permitted to vote upon it, because it affects the interests of the Capital of the Nation. Certainly no one can be disfranchised in his own State for voting upon any proposition of that kind.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator from Washington whether the language he proposes confines the voting privilege to citizens of the United States?

Mr. JONES. It confines it to residents of the District of Columbia, male and female, of the age of 21 years, and so forth.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I have not the bill before me, and that is the reason I asked the question.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Washington that it might be well to make the provision read "resident citizens of the United States."

Mr. JONES. I accept that.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I think there should be some such provision.

Mr. JONES. I accept that suggestion.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If we use the words "resident citizens of the United States," that will show even more clearly that the purpose is to permit a vote here on this question without affecting their status as citizens of the respective States.

Mr. JONES. I accept that suggestion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. One moment, so that we may keep the RECORD straight. The Chair understands that the Senator from Washington has accepted the suggestion of the Senator from Georgia and modifies his amendment in that respect.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, before that is accepted, that is exactly the point I wanted to inquire about. What does the Senator from Georgia mean definitely by the expression "a citizen of the United States"?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I mean just what the term implies, a person who in a State would be allowed under the laws of the State to vote. If he were foreign-born, he would have to be naturalized.

Mr. CLARK. That was not the point to which I directed attention. The point to which I wish to direct attention is, What is a citizen of the United States? Of course, there is no such thing as a voting citizen of the United States, and, therefore, if the amendment is to be made, the word "citizen" ought to be so defined as to carry a voting qualification.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think we have fixed the voting qualifications in this bill.

Mr. CLARK. We have not fixed the voting qualifications of citizens of the United States. The voting qualifications of each citizen is fixed by the State in which he resides.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I think a constitutional amendment prescribes the qualifications of a citizen of the United States as one born in the United States or duly naturalized.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That is what I understand. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. That is my view of the matter.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, line 8, of the substitute, after the word "citizens," insert the words "of the United States and," so that it will read "that all resident citizens of the United States and of the District of Columbia."

Mr. JONES. No; that is not the amendment. The amendment strikes out the words "resident citizens" and inserts the words "residents, citizens of the United States." The words "residents who are citizens of the United States" would perhaps be better, and I suggest it be changed in that way.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, line 8, it is proposed to strike out the words "resident citizens" and insert the words "residents, citizens of the United States."

Mr. JONES. After the word "residents," insert the words "who are citizens of the United States."

The SECRETARY. "Residents who are citizens of the United States."

Mr. JONES. In line 14 there is a further amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 14, following the amendment heretofore agreed to, it is proposed to insert the words "whether they maintain or have maintained a voting status elsewhere or not."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I desire to make a suggestion to the Senator from Washington. It occurs to me that very much confusion may arise by the use of the words "resident citizens." I think residence is universally the test of the right to vote, and, strictly speaking, all of these people to whom we desire to extend the right to vote by this amendment—and I am with the Senator from Washington upon that—vote in the States from which they come, because they are residents not of the District of Columbia, but of those States; and they are not, as it seems to me, appropriately described at all as "resident citizens of the District." They are resident citizens of the States from which they come, and in which they claim the right regularly to vote.

Mr. JONES. The word that I used was "residents."

Mr. WALSH. I understand.

Mr. JONES. If the Senator can suggest anything that he thinks will cover the matter I shall be very glad to accept it. I thought that I would save time. This matter will go to another body, and I suggest that it can be taken care of all right.

Mr. WALSH. I was going to suggest to the Senator that the language "citizens of the United States domiciled within the District for the period of 12 months prior to such election" would express the idea, I think, better than the language used.

Mr. JONES. I would suggest that probably it would be well to let this matter go, and then it can be taken care of in the other body.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington to the substitute offered by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I should like to have that portion of the section read as it will appear if the amendment is adopted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the section as amended, or that portion of it.

The Secretary read as follows:

That all residents who are citizens of the United States and of the District of Columbia who are over the age of 21 years, of sound mind, and have been not convicted of an offense involving moral turpitude—

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That is sufficient for my purpose. It seems to me the language would be very much confused by that provision. As I understand it, it provides that all residents who are citizens of the United States and of the District of Columbia—that is, citizens of the District of Columbia—

Mr. JONES. No; the words "of the District of Columbia" ought to be stricken out.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. What the Senator intends to do is to provide that all persons who are domiciled in the District of Columbia, and who are citizens of the United States, shall be permitted to vote, irrespective of the fact that they have a voting status in some other place?

Mr. JONES. Yes; and if I can have that language, I—

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Why not say that?

Mr. JONES. I would be glad to have that said, but I am trying to save as much time as possible in getting to a vote, and not to strike out any more of the bill than is necessary; that is all.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator from Montana is exactly correct about it.

Mr. JONES. I agree to that.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. When we provide that residents of the District of Columbia shall be permitted to vote, we thereby exclude from voting the very persons whom the Senator desires to have vote, because a person can not be a resident in two places. A person may be domiciled in Washington and have a residence in the State of Washington or in the State of Utah.

Mr. JONES. The Senator and I are agreed, if he will suggest the language.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I suggest, as the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] has substantially already suggested, that it be made to read "That all persons domiciled in the District of Columbia, who are citizens of the United States, over the age of 21 years," and so forth.

Mr. JONES. That is all right. I accept that.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend the language so that it will read:

SEC. 2. That all persons domiciled in the District of Columbia who are citizens of the United States—

And so forth.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It will then be necessary to change the word "residents" farther down, in line 11, so that it will read "who have been so domiciled in the District of Columbia."

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out, on line 11, the words "residents of," and insert "so domiciled in," so that that part will read:

And who have been so domiciled in the District of Columbia.

SEVERAL SENATORS. For what length of time?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. For more than one year.

Mr. JONES. That is already in the section.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Washington, as now agreed upon, to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, on page 1, in line 2, I move to strike out the word "male." I offer that as an amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understood that that had been adopted. Has it not?

Mr. BORAH. No; it was in section 2, on page 2, that that was adopted.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Oh, well, as the Senate has already fixed the suffrage with males and females, I am perfectly willing to accept the suggestion of the Senator from Idaho and let the same provision extend to the petition. I accept that.

The SECRETARY. On page 1, line 2, before the word "taxpayers," it is proposed to strike out the word "male."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BORAH. On page 4, after the word "his," in line 1, I move to insert "or her."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I accept that.

The SECRETARY. On page 4, line 1, after the word "his," it is proposed to insert "or her," so that it will read:

The ballot issued in said election shall have printed thereon such phraseology as will enable each voter to express intelligently and clearly his or her choice on the issue to be voted upon.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BORAH. On the same page, line 8, after the word "he," I move to insert "or she."

The SECRETARY. On page 4, line 8, after the word "he," the second word in the line, it is proposed to insert "or she."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I accept that.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BORAH. And on the same page, on line 11, after the word "his," I move to insert the words "or her."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I accept that.

The SECRETARY. On page 4, line 11, after the word "his," it is proposed to insert the words "or her."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BORAH. And in line 12, after the word "his," I move to insert the same words, "or her."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I accept that.

The SECRETARY. On line 12, after the word "his," it is proposed to insert the words "or her."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I move to amend by striking out, on page 2, lines 15 and 16, the words "The managers of the said election shall be the sole judges of the qualifications of the voters."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 1, lines 15 and 16, it is proposed to strike out the following words:

The managers of the said election shall be the sole judges of the qualifications of the voters.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Before agreeing to that, Mr. President, I should like to know who is to determine the qualifications.

Mr. WORKS. I do not know; but certainly the managers of the election ought not to remain the sole judges, the exclusive judges. It is possible that the courts might be called upon to determine that question at some stage, and I think it is not wise to make them the sole judges.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The way the bill is being framed somebody ought to judge, of course.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, when a voter presents himself at the polls and his vote is contested somebody has to determine whether or not he is entitled to cast his vote. This proposition is perfectly fair. I do not see how anyone who favors prohibition can object to it, because two of the commis-

sioners of the District, I understand, are prohibitionists. They will appoint these judges, one on each side of the question, and they will pass on the question as to whether or not the contested vote should be cast. If we strike this out of the bill, then we do not leave it for anybody to determine as to whether a vote shall be cast or not, whether it is a legal vote. So I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, the trouble about it is that this provision makes the managers the sole judges. Usually where a vote is challenged the voter is required to make affidavit of his qualifications, and that, of course, permits his vote. But the question may arise later on as to his qualifications if there should be any contest of the election, and certainly that door ought not to be closed.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. This bill provides that the District Commissioners may adopt such rules and regulations for the conduct of this election as they may prescribe. They can provide in their rules and regulations for the taking of an oath; but at the election somebody must determine whether the voter shall vote. I do not know how it is in other States, but in my State the judges of election determine that. This is not a final determination. It is the determination under the qualifications prescribed in this bill.

Mr. HARDWICK, Mr. SUTHERLAND, and Mr. THOMPSON addressed the Chair.

Mr. WORKS. Well, Mr. President, the commissioners could not make any rules or regulations in violation of the express terms of the bill that these managers shall be the sole judges.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me for just a moment—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. WORKS. Yes.

Mr. HARDWICK. I think I can make a suggestion which will avoid this trouble. It is to strike out the word "sole."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. All right. I am perfectly willing to consent to that.

Mr. HARDWICK. They must be the primary judges.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will consent to strike out the word "sole," leaving it to read that they shall be the judges of the qualifications of the voters.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from Alabama ought to consent to striking out the word "sole." As I understand the rule which prevails in the various States, it is that the judges of election in the first instance constitute the sole judges of the qualifications of the voters who present themselves. If a man comes to the polls to vote, and his vote is challenged, he has the right under some statutes to make an affidavit, to swear to the facts which constitute his qualifications, and then the judges determine whether or not he shall cast his vote. If they determine against him, that is the end of the matter so far as the right of a person to vote is concerned. If, however, the judges under some circumstances deny the right to vote to a man who has such a right, then he has his action at law. That is the remedy which he has.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I agree with the Senator from Utah; but I do not think and did not think that to strike out the word "sole" affects the matter one way or the other, so I let it go out.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, while the election officers may determine whether or not the proposed voter shall cast his vote, they have no right to determine conclusively what his qualifications are. This provides not only that they shall undertake to determine whether or not he shall cast his vote, but that they are the sole judges of his qualifications, which I understand to mean the exclusive judges. It will cut off any inquiry in the future. Certainly the Senator from Utah does not maintain that that ought to be done.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I consent to the amendment on those terms. If the referendum is adopted, I have no doubt that between the two Houses this question will be straightened out.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary is unable to determine just the terms of the amendment which is proposed to be offered, and is accepted.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out the word "sole" on page 2, line 16, before the word "judges."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is correct.

Mr. WORKS. That is correct.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I have one other amendment to the original bill. I have submitted it to the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD], and he is willing to accept it. Before the vote is taken I should like to offer it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I should like to get a vote on this referendum. The Senator can take up that matter later. If we go into the amendment of the Sheppard bill again, we will not get a vote this afternoon.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I should like to know whether I will have a right to offer this amendment at a later time if the substitute is adopted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will have an opportunity in the Senate to amend anything done as in Committee of the Whole. The question now before the Senate is the adoption of the substitute, as amended, offered by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. On that I ask for the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, before the vote is taken, just one other suggestion with reference to the phraseology. On line 12 of page 2, in line with the amendments which have already been made, the words "in which they reside" should be stricken out and the words "of their domicile" should be inserted. I suggest that amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, lines 12 and 13, after the word "precinct," it is proposed to strike out the words "in which they reside" and in lieu thereof to insert "of their domicile."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. As I understand, that is to make the bill conform to what has already been done, and I accept it.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] as amended. The yeas and nays have been called for and ordered. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CATRON (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN]. I am assured that the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] would vote as I will vote. I therefore transfer my pair to him and vote "yea."

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL], who is not present. I therefore withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN]. If the Senator from New York were present, he would vote "yea" and I would vote "nay."

Mr. McLEAN (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. OVERMAN (when Mr. SIMMONS's name was called). Making the same announcement as previously made as to my colleague, I am requested by him to state that if he were present he would vote "nay."

Mr. WALSH (when his name was called). Making the same transfer of my pair as on the former vote, I vote "nay." I wish to announce that the absence of my colleague [Mr. MYERS] is due to illness. If he were present, he would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I have been requested to state that the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], with whom I have a pair, which I transferred to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH], were he present, would vote for this amendment. The Senator from Colorado would vote against it.

Mr. KERN. I have been requested to announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA] on account of illness in his family. If the Senator from Tennessee were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH of Michigan (after having voted in the negative). I did not hear the announcement of the Senator from Georgia. Was it concerning the senior or the junior Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The senior Senator.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Has the junior Senator from Massachusetts voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. He has not voted.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I have a pair with him on this question, and I therefore withdraw my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I arise to announce that the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] is absent owing to illness and that were he present he would vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GORR] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA].

The roll call resulted—yeas 38, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—38.

Bankhead	Hardwick	Newlands	Stone
Brandagee	Hitchcock	Oliver	Sutherland
Bryan	Hollis	Page	Tillman
Catron	Hughes	Penrose	Underwood
Clark	James	Pittman	Wadsworth
Colt	Johnson, Me.	Pomerene	Warren
Culberson	Kern	Reed	Watson
Dillingham	La Follette	Saulsbury	Williams
du Pont	Lee, Md.	Smith, Ariz.	
Harding	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Md.	

NAYS—38.

Ashurst	Gore	Nelson	Sterling
Beckham	Gronna	Norris	Swanson
Borah	Husting	Overman	Thomas
Brady	Johnson, S. Dak.	Phelan	Thompson
Chamberlain	Jones	Polindexter	Townsend
Clapp	Kenyon	Sheppard	Vardaman
Cummins	Kirby	Sherman	Walsh
Curtis	Lane	Shields	Weeks
Fernald	McCumber	Smith, Ga.	
Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Smoot	

NOT VOTING—20.

Broussard	Lea, Tenn.	Myers	Shafroth
Chilton	Lewis	O'Gorman	Simmons
Fall	Lippitt	Owen	Smith, Mich.
Gallinger	Lodge	Ransdell	Smith, S. C.
Goff	McLean	Robinson	Weeks

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On the amendment of the Senator from Alabama as amended the yeas are 38 and the nays are 38. The amendment is therefore rejected. The bill is still as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I have one other amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 17 of the bill, after line 2, it is proposed to insert a new section, to be known as section 13a, and to read as follows:

That the treating or giving of intoxicating liquors to any minor by any person other than the father, mother, or guardian of such minor, or a physician for medical purposes, shall be unlawful; and any person violating the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be punished therefor as provided in section 1 of this act for unlawfully selling intoxicating liquors.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have no objection to that amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that this is the first time the question of treating has come into this bill. It does not stop at the treating of minors by the father or the mother or the guardian or the physician, but it goes on to say that the gift to minors by the guardian, the father, the mother, or the physician is lawful. It seems to me there can be nothing that will make the bill more ridiculous than if that proposition is accepted and made a part of this so-called prohibition bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Kansas to strike out the words "treating or." It is incomprehensible to me that the father or mother is going to treat the son. Then it will cover simply the giving of intoxicating liquors.

Mr. THOMPSON. Very well; I will consent to that. I will simply say to the Senator from Utah that this is the language of the Kansas statute on the same subject.

Mr. SMOOT. That does not make any difference as to the remarks which I have made.

Mr. THOMPSON. It has met with success in the administration of the law in Kansas, and I hope it will here.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out the words "treating or," so that it will read:

That the giving of intoxicating liquors to any minor by any person—And so forth.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas as modified. [Putting the question.] By the sound the noes seem to have it. [A pause.] The noes have it, and the amendment is rejected.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rose before the vote was announced to make an inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair did not so understand, but will now hear the Senator.

Mr. REED. I want to know whether the Chair has decided upon the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has decided that the amendment was rejected.

Mr. REED. I ask that that particular part of the language be read as it now stands in the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment was not adopted.

Mr. REED. I want to have the language of the bill to which this amendment was offered read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the section.

The SECRETARY. It is a new section, to be known as section 13a, that was offered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is still in Committee of the Whole and subject to amendment. If there are no further amendments as in Committee of the Whole the bill will be reported to the Senate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. On account of there being a tie vote on the question of the referendum, I desire to reserve the amendment so that we may have a vote in the Senate on my amendment. If it had been otherwise I would not do so. I desire to ask the Senator from Texas if he is not willing to agree to an adjournment. I am willing to agree to a time to vote to-morrow.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I do not feel that I would be justified in agreeing to an adjournment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am sure the Senator understands that we can not get a vote this evening.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. REED. It is necessary to have a short executive session in order that numerous appointments may be referred to proper committees and be passed upon before the holidays. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion made by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. VARDAMAN and Mr. GRONNA called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). I announce my pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] and withhold my vote.

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] and withhold my vote.

Mr. OVERMAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]. He is not present, and I withhold my vote.

Mr. WALSH (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CATRON (after having voted in the affirmative). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] and allow my vote to stand.

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 41, as follows:

YEAS—32.

Bankhead	Hardwick	Lee, Md.	Reed
Brandagee	Hitchcock	Martine, N. J.	Saulsbury
Bryan	Hollis	Newlands	Smith, Ariz.
Catron	Hughes	Oliver	Smith, Md.
Clark	Husting	Penrose	Stone
Colt	James	Phelan	Thomas
Culberson	Johnson, Me.	Pittman	Underwood
du Pont	La Follette	Pomerene	Wadsworth

NAYS—41.

Beckham	Harding	Norris	Swanson
Borah	Johnson, S. Dak.	Page	Thompson
Brady	Jones	Polindexter	Townsend
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Sheppard	Vardaman
Clapp	Kern	Sherman	Walsh
Cummins	Kirby	Shields	Watson
Curtis	Lane	Smith, Ga.	Williams
Dillingham	McCumber	Smith, Mich.	Weeks
Fernald	McLean	Smoot	
Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Sterling	
Gronna	Nelson	Sutherland	

NOT VOTING—23.

Ashurst	Gore	O'Gorman	Simmons
Broussard	Lea, Tenn.	Overman	Smith, S. C.
Chilton	Lewis	Owen	Tillman
Fall	Lippitt	Ransdell	Warren
Gallinger	Lodge	Robinson	Weeks
Goff	Myers	Shafroth	

So the Senate refused to proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. In view of the Senator from Alabama having reserved the right to offer his amendment in the Senate, I desire to give notice of an amendment to his amendment. I reserve the same right. I submit the amendment and ask to have it printed in the RECORD.

The amendment was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Add at the end of section 4 of the Underwood substitute:
 "At the said registration each person registering and so desiring shall be allowed to designate the national party to which he or she belongs, and the initial letter or letters of such party shall be put down in an appropriate column opposite the name of each person so designating his or her party for the purpose of showing the voter's party affiliation, and at an appropriate time prior to the conventions of the various parties for nominating candidates for President and Vice President of the United States, upon the written request of 25 per cent of the voters in any national party so registered and so designating their national party, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall hold a primary election for delegates from the District of Columbia to all the national conventions under the terms of this act of the national parties that may have so many as 5 per cent of the total number of voters voting upon the issue to be voted upon under this act, and that such candidates for election as delegates to such conventions as shall in writing notify the said commissioners of their candidacy shall be voted upon in such primary, and those candidates in each party having the largest number of votes and to the number of delegates allowed to the District of Columbia in the several party conventions shall be certified as elected to the proper officials of such conventions by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia; and after the first general registration provided for in this act the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall retain custody of the registration books and shall give notice of times when persons desiring to register and designate their party affiliations or to change their party affiliations may do so at the office of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. Voting and candidacy in such primary elections shall be confined to the members of each party, and no registration or changing of affiliation shall be permitted save at a date or dates not less than six months prior to the date of the national convention of any party affected."

Mr. REED. I offer the following amendment. On page 2, lines 5, 6, and 7, I move to strike out the words "for beverage purposes or for any other than scientific, medicinal, pharmaceutical, mechanical, sacramental, or other nonbeverage purposes" and to insert in lieu thereof:

No alcoholic or other prohibited liquors shall be exported from the District of Columbia into any State or Territory of the United States.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the Senator from Missouri will allow me to interrupt him, I think we can reach an agreement to vote on the bill.

Mr. President, I have no desire whatever to delay a vote or final action on this bill. If there had not been a tie vote in the Senate, I would have allowed the bill to go through without further objection. The Senate has itself expressed no conclusion except a conclusion on the parliamentary situation. Some days ago I might by my own vote have delayed action on this bill and put some other bill in its place. I want to say to the Senator from Texas that I have no desire in the world to postpone action or to hinder the passage of the bill if he demonstrates that a majority are in favor of his proposition.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If the Senator will pardon me, he said he wanted a vote this afternoon.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I did.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And on that account Senators on the other side refrained from speaking, having understood that he and I agreed to a vote this afternoon on the bill and amendments.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. On my amendment.

Mr. SHEPPARD. On the amendment and on the bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; it was on my amendment that I was asking for a vote. What I agreed to was a vote on my amendment.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I did not so understand it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is what I understood. I was not concerned about the bill. Now, we have a tie vote in the Senate. The Senate ought to express its will. I think we will expedite the passage of the bill by reaching an agreement to vote on this amendment and all other amendments and the bill to-morrow at an hour to be fixed. I am willing to make that agreement and hope that the gentlemen in favor of the bill will agree to an hour to-morrow. I would say 1 or 2 o'clock, whichever is most agreeable. I ask unanimous consent—

Mr. POINDEXTER. I object, Mr. President.

Mr. BORAH. Is the Senator submitting a proposed agreement?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I desire to submit a proposition. I desire to ask unanimous consent that at 1 o'clock to-morrow the Senate shall proceed to vote upon the substitute proposed by myself and all pending amendments and on the bill.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I object.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Say 5 o'clock.

Mr. GALLINGER. Objection has been made.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would rather not agree to as late an hour as 5, because at that hour a great many Senators are away. I will agree to 4.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Make it 4 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] has made an objection, so that a roll call

for a quorum would be productive of no result. The Chair will order a roll call, however, if the Senator presses his request for unanimous consent.

Mr. GALLINGER. An objection has been made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. An objection having been made a roll call is not necessary.

Mr. REED. Did the Senator object to 4 o'clock?

Mr. POINDEXTER and others. Regular order!

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri is entitled to the floor.

Mr. REED. I had just concluded offering an amendment. I ask the Secretary to read it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, lines 5, 6, and 7, after the word "liquors," in line 5, strike out the words "for beverage purposes or for any other than scientific, medicinal, pharmaceutical, mechanical, sacramental, or other nonbeverage purposes," and in lieu insert:

No alcoholic or other prohibited liquors shall be exported from the District of Columbia into any State or Territory of the United States.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am not offering this amendment as a matter of delay. It is the amendment which I offered in substance yesterday morning. It was stated at that time that the amendment as drawn would affect liquors sold within the District as well as liquors sold outside of the District, and would bar the sale within the District of liquors used for medicinal purposes. At the time it was suggested that I should withdraw the amendment and allow the Senator from Alabama to offer his substitute. I did so and the time from that hour to this has been occupied with the consideration of the substitute. This is the first opportunity I have had to present this amendment.

Mr. President, I will state the sole effect of the amendment. Under the bill as it stands alcohol can be manufactured in the District of Columbia and sold in unlimited quantities in any State of the Union unless the local laws prohibit it. There is in the bill the language that it can not be sold outside of the District for beverage purposes, but I have already called attention to the fact that large quantities of alcohol are manufactured within the District, and that the sale of that alcohol outside of the District is not limited by the words "for beverage purposes," because alcohol is never used for beverage purposes; it is a raw material which enters into many kinds of drinks, and it is a raw material from which whisky is made.

Mr. STONE rose.

Mr. REED. Does my colleague desire to interrupt me?

Mr. STONE. If my colleague will permit me, it seems to me so perfectly patent and clear that it is in the interest of the business before the Senate and the general business of the Senate that this matter should be postponed until to-morrow—

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator might add in the interest of the Western Union Telegraph Co.

Mr. STONE. Possibly so. Senators are leaving the Chamber, as will be seen, and in a little while we shall be without a quorum; and if we can get to an agreement to vote at some hour to-morrow, why continue this controversy when we shall be presently without a quorum? I was about to move, if it is agreeable to the Senator in charge of the bill, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, and I make that motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Missouri that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, December 20, 1916, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 19, 1916.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE.

Kimbrough Stone, of Kansas City, Mo., to be United States circuit judge for the eighth circuit, vice Elmer B. Adams, deceased.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

Duval West, of San Antonio, Tex., to be United States district judge, western district of Texas, vice Thomas S. Maxey, resigned.

CONFIRMATION.

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate December 19, 1916.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

William F. Wolfe to be United States attorney for the western district of Wisconsin.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, December 19, 1916.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord God, our Heavenly Father, help us, we beseech Thee, to fulfill the longings, hopes, and aspirations of our hearts by resisting the allurements of sin and yielding to the demands of our better self, that we may satisfy our conscience, merit the full confidence of our fellow men, and enjoy the sweet and holy communion with Thee which is Life Eternal, the fruits of which are peace, joy, and righteousness in the Holy Ghost; and all praise be Thine, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CONDITIONS RELATING TO INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to bring to the attention of the House a very important matter, and being unable to assert that it is a privileged matter I ask unanimous consent for three minutes to make a statement about it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent for three minutes to make a statement. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House will remember that last July Congress enacted a joint resolution raising a joint special committee to investigate conditions of transportation, expecting that that committee would work during the approaching recess of Congress; but the recess did not approach as early as we expected. The session was protracted into the fall, and the committee found themselves unable to accomplish much. They worked 14 days, I believe, before the meeting of the present session; but all the members of that committee from the two Houses are interested in legislation and are compelled to be present in their own committees and at the sessions of their respective Houses, and they have found it impossible to do justice to that investigation without neglecting their legislative duties. Therefore they have determined to ask the Congress, before proceeding any further, to extend the time in which that committee have to report, and they have instructed me to present to the House a resolution to that effect. In conformity with that instruction, I have introduced House joint resolution 323, extending the time from the second Monday in the approaching January until the succeeding year in which that committee may report. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of that joint resolution, discharging the committee to which it has been referred.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it by title.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 323) to amend a joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution creating a joint subcommittee from the membership of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate the conditions relating to interstate and foreign commerce, and the necessity of further legislation relating thereto, and defining the powers and duties of such subcommittee," approved July 20, 1916.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. ADAMSON. With pleasure.

Mr. RAYBURN. Does the gentleman really think that from the beginning this committee was necessary?

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I assume that that question was concluded when Congress last summer determined to raise the committee for that investigation. I do not want to impeach the wisdom of the two Houses of Congress in ordering the investigation. We have done our best under that order to investigate. We have worked diligently, and we have not finished the work. If it was ever necessary, it is necessary yet.

Mr. RAYBURN. How long does the gentleman think it would take a committee of this character to investigate all the propositions contained in the Newlands resolution, with any degree of satisfaction, or to give any information which would be valuable to the country or to the House?

Mr. ADAMSON. We discussed that very question in the committee at the last meeting, and some of the members of

the committee thought 60 days, and I thought 30 days. I believe in 30 days of real work we can complete the hearings.

Mr. RAYBURN. The committee has been organized for six months.

Mr. ADAMSON. It was organized before Congress adjourned, but you know the members of that joint subcommittee are also active members of their respective committees and of the House, more or less, and that it is impossible for us to be in two places and to do two things at once. I myself have a sort of a one-track, narrow-gauge mind, and I can not do more than one important thing at a time. We found that during the session of Congress we could not do justice to the subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RAYBURN. I object.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. FITZGERALD, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported a bill (H. R. 19178) to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 1232), which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] reserves all points of order.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MANN. About what, just for information?

Mr. ALLEN. On the instability of human institutions.

Mr. MANN. What is that?

Mr. ALLEN. In other words, on the attempt to abolish the Subtreasury at Cincinnati.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the conservation of our natural resources.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the conservation of our natural resources. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. McCracken, until January 12, on account of important business.

To Mr. CAREW, for the remainder of this week, on account of a death in his family.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. ANDERSON] be excused on account of sickness.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that his colleague [Mr. ANDERSON] be excused on account of sickness. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATIONS.

On motion of Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 18542) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes, with Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the legislative bill, of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 18542) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 6. That to provide, during the fiscal year 1918, for increased compensation at the rate of 10 per cent per annum to employees who receive salaries at a rate per annum less than \$1,200, and for increased compensation at the rate of 5 per cent per annum to employees who receive salaries at a rate not more than \$1,800 per annum and not less than \$1,200 per annum, so much as may be necessary is appropriated: *Provided*, That this section shall only apply to the employees

of the Library of Congress, the Botanic Garden, and the executive and judicial establishments, who are appropriated for in this act specifically and under lump sums or whose employment is authorized herein: *Provided further*, That detailed reports shall be submitted to Congress on the first day of the next session showing the number of persons, the grades or character of positions, the original rates of compensation, and the increased rates of compensation provided for herein.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the section.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether it is the desire of the committee to consider this section under the rule or as it stands in the bill. I should suppose they would want to consider it under the rule although they voted against the rule.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. We will consider it under the rule.

Mr. MANN. Not unless it goes out on a point of order. The rule authorizes an amendment to be offered and this is the original language. If the original language of the bill does not go out on a point of order the rule has no application whatever. I have reserved a point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. We are not going to make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois make the point of order?

Mr. MANN. No, Mr. Chairman; I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will reserve a point of order for the time being.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment again reported?

The CHAIRMAN. There is no amendment. Section 6 was read and the gentleman from Wisconsin has reserved a point of order. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin make the point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to the original section in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman there is no original section in the bill.

Mr. MANN. I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment as a new section:

Page 142, line 15, insert the following, a new section, as section 7: "That to provide, during the fiscal year 1918, for increased compensation at the rate of 10 per cent per annum to employees who receive salaries at a rate per annum less than \$1,200, and for increased compensation at the rate of 5 per cent per annum to employees who receive salaries at a rate not more than \$1,800 per annum and not less than \$1,200 per annum, so much as may be necessary is appropriated: *Provided*, That this section shall only apply to the employees of the Library of Congress, the Botanic Garden, and the executive and judicial establishments, who are appropriated for in this act specifically and under lump sums or whose employment is authorized herein: *Provided further*, That detailed reports shall be submitted to Congress on the first day of the next session showing the number of persons, the grades or character of positions, the original rates of compensation, and the increased rates of compensation provided for herein."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The Chair sustained the point of order. Under the ruling, has not section 6 gone out?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; but this is offered as a new section—section 7.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will not that leave a hiatus?

The CHAIRMAN. That can be changed later on.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that while a member of the Committee on Appropriations has the prior right, the Chair did recognize the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] to offer an amendment.

Mr. CANNON. I am a member of the committee, and I offer an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I submit that when the gentleman from Colorado took the floor to offer an amendment there was no member of the committee asking for recognition by the Chair.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Nobody is entitled to offer an amendment at present. The gentleman from Tennessee has offered an amendment and is entitled to the floor under the five-minute rule. I suggest that we endeavor to make some arrangement for debate and have the proposed amendments submitted in

advance so that Members will know what we propose to discuss and what they will be called to vote upon. We can arrange the time and take the vote after the discussion is over.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to state that he should have recognized the gentleman on the committee, but had already recognized the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING]. The gentleman from Tennessee has now offered an amendment and is entitled to the floor.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I think that the suggestion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] is a good one.

Mr. FITZGERALD. How much time is desired to discuss these questions?

Mr. CANNON. I would like a little time on an amendment I propose to offer to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MANN. I do not see how we can arrange time now.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If Members will indicate what their amendments are, we can arrange for it.

Mr. MANN. It is now 25 minutes past 11 o'clock, and we will probably not do any more than to finish this bill to-day. This is the last section of the bill. I do not think you can get much idea of how much time is necessary or desired until debate has run for a while.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Members would know what the different propositions are that they are called upon to vote on.

Mr. MANN. But there is no way of limiting the number of amendments.

Mr. FITZGERALD. We frequently do it by agreement.

Mr. STAFFORD. I suggest one hour on a side.

Mr. MANN. Oh, we can not get through this by half past 1 o'clock.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am not suggesting any limit of time, but trying to find out how much time is wanted.

Mr. MANN. I think you had better run for a while.

Mr. FITZGERALD. We might ascertain how many amendments there are.

Mr. MANN. You can not, because some Member may offer an amendment later growing out of the situation. After the House has listened for a considerable length of time to this matter I think it will be disposed to close it up.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, when would it be in order to offer an amendment to the proposition submitted by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS]?

The CHAIRMAN. As soon as the gentleman from Tennessee has yielded the floor on his amendment it will be in order to offer an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. CANNON. We are operating under the five-minute rule?

The CHAIRMAN. We are.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is entitled to the floor, and then the Chair has promised to recognize the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is the gentleman from Tennessee to discuss his amendment.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to discuss this amendment at length now, and certainly not until after some of the amendments which certain Members have indicated they propose to offer have been presented. The committee felt, in view of the general sentiment which seems to exist, that some recognition ought to be taken of the fact that there is now and has been an unprecedented increase in the cost of living. The committee could not expect to bring in a proposition which would meet the views of every individual Member. There were various suggestions made in the committee, some involving a slightly greater increase, some involving a less increase. The matter was discussed and considered for several days in the committee, and after a very thorough discussion and consideration of all the questions arising, both as to the necessity for an increase and as to the condition of the Treasury, the committee finally agreed on the proposition reported in the bill, which has been re-presented as an amendment.

I submit to the gentlemen of the House that it is a fair and liberal increase under all of the circumstances and conditions. There is a sentiment existing in many portions of the country in favor of increases of the wages paid to employees, but I dare say there are few, if any, cases, certainly none which have been brought to my attention, where a greater increase has been allowed than 10 per cent, and the Department of Labor has reported that the usual rule in those cases where increases have been allowed is 10 per cent, among those factories and large

employers in the various textile mills in New England and other portions of the country, and I wish to call the attention of Members to the fact that in all those mills nearly all of the employees receive less than \$1,200 per annum. This committee has recommended that, in so far as the employees of the Government in this bill are concerned, there shall be an increase during the year 1918 of 10 per cent of the salary or wages paid to those employees who draw less than \$1,200 a year and 5 per cent to those who draw from \$1,200 to \$1,800 per year. Gentlemen must not forget the fact that when we undertake to establish a rule or precedent in this bill the same rule and precedent will be invoked when other appropriation bills come before the House. You must not forget the fact that this bill covers less than one-twentieth of the employees of the whole United States Government, and that in establishing this rule and precedent for less than one-twentieth of the employees of the Government you will later on be confronted with the question of whether or not you will be equally fair and equally liberal with the other nineteen-twentieths of the employees of the Government. I am speaking in round numbers and terms. It is impossible even with this amendment to determine accurately exactly what this amendment will mean in the way of an increase in the expenditures of the Government, due to the fact that many of the employees are employed under lump sums, and for an indefinite length of time; but as can best be determined the increase which would be brought about by the amendment proposed will mean from \$1,500,000 to \$2,000,000 for the employees in this bill alone, and, as I have just suggested, the same rule will be invoked as to all of the other employees of the Government. So, you see that in establishing a rule of precedent here in this bill you may, if you adopt some of the propositions which will be presented later on in the day, and which I have heard privately discussed, establish a precedent that will increase the expenditures of the Government from fifty to one hundred millions of dollars, or even more.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman whether or not the same reasons that impelled the raising of the wages of the clerks under \$1,200 by 10 per cent would not extend to the employees of the House and the Senate, who are compelled to live here in the District, and whether the committee recognized the fact that this bill carried appropriations for employees of the House and Senate, and whether the committee would not be willing to include the employees of the House and Senate in those entitled to the 10 per cent increase?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That was considered in the committee, but there is this distinction between the Capitol employees and the employees in the departments of the Government. This Congress will adjourn in March next. It is true the bill does not go into effect until July 1, 1918, but the next session of the House will not begin until next December. That session will probably be completed by June or July of the following year, or at the latest August. In other words, the employees of the Capitol are actually on duty about 12 out of the 24 months of the term, and therefore there is a distinction between the services performed by the Capitol employees and those who work in the departments from one year to another. As the gentleman knows, during the recesses of Congress the employees are given vacations, and probably half of them—I know in some particular cases that many—remain here while the other half go home or go about other business.

Mr. BORLAND. I think there is a large number of them who are unable to engage in any other business. Some of them are here, and those who go home are home only for a brief time, and possibly when they go home and come back it is in the end an expense instead of an advantage; so that it does seem to me that the same rule that would apply to clerks in the departments would apply to the employees of the Senate and House, and I desire to submit that proposition to the House.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman will be able to discuss that when it is considered. I do not want to discuss this matter at length now, as I said, but I hope to be given the opportunity to say something else on the subject later on, after some of these amendments are offered. But I do want to repeat that the committee having this bill under consideration gave this matter the most serious and most deliberate consideration, and the committee was unanimously of the opinion that the increase proposed was most liberal, especially when

you take into consideration the fact, as the chairman of this committee stated yesterday, that we are facing a great deficit in the Treasury next year. The papers upon yesterday and today called the attention of Congress and the country to the fact that unless something is done, unless some measure is adopted which will increase the taxes and burdens of the people, it will become necessary to issue bonds next year.

Now, I have always been in favor of those who labor. I belong to that class myself, and I have never failed to cast my vote in favor of legislation looking to their welfare and to their interests; but, gentlemen, in passing upon this measure to-day we should think of the laboring man back home who will have to pay such increases as you place upon this bill and other appropriations. This money can not come out of the air; it does not grow upon trees; somebody has got to pay it; and those who will pay it are the laboring men back home and all over this country—the farmers and the business men. I think we should be fair to those who pay as well as to those who receive, and in our desire to serve the one we should not forget the other. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be adopted without amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 142, line 16, after the word "provide," insert "during the remainder of the fiscal year 1917 and."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman from New York state his point of order?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The pending amendment provides for increase of compensation during the fiscal year 1918, for which this bill makes appropriation. If it were proposed to increase the salary of some one place in the bill and an appropriation were carried to do so, it would not be seriously contended that a provision would be in order appropriating enough money to increase the compensation of that place during the remainder of the current fiscal year. The gentleman from Illinois will not make that contention. If that be true as to one it would be true as to two, and it would be true as to all positions in the bill. This bill makes appropriation for the executive, legislative, and judicial departments of the Government for the fiscal year ending 1918. The compensation for places during that year is provided, and this provision is not inconsistent with the purposes of the bill. It merely provides a scale of increase during the period for which the appropriations are made. The gentleman proposes to introduce a matter that is not germane, in that it would enact legislation proposing increases of compensation during the balance of the current fiscal year. I submit it is clearly subject to the point of order.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I think it is not subject to the point of order. I refer to Rule IX, paragraph 3, page 293, of the manual:

To appropriation of the revenue for the support of the Government as herein provided, viz, for legislative, executive, and judicial expenses; for sundry civil expenses; for fortifications and coast defenses; for the District of Columbia; for pensions; and for all deficiencies—to the Committee on Appropriations.

So that the jurisdiction of that committee to report to the House for its consideration is covered by that rule without regard to which general appropriation bill the amendment might be offered.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the gentleman will yield?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. FITZGERALD. In order to report a deficiency that is in order it must be authorized by law.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, the special rule authorizes the legislation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But it must be authorized by law. There is no authority for any increase of compensation for the balance of the current fiscal year.

Mr. CANNON. No authority. If the point of order was made upon this provision and sustained, that brings us to the consideration of this provision the same as if no point of order had been made.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is true; but the amendment must be germane to be in order.

Mr. CANNON. Precisely; and it is germane.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, no.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, well, the gentleman says, "Oh, no." I would be glad indeed if the gentleman would point out anything in the rule that prohibits the Committee on Appropriations from reporting upon a sundry civil bill or any other general appropriation bill a deficiency for the present fiscal year.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I admit that deficiency appropriations are in order on this bill, but a deficiency appropriation can not be in order unless the service or compensation is already authorized by law. The gentleman from Illinois is proposing to legislate fixing the compensation. The compensation for these places is fixed by law for the current year.

Mr. CANNON. Precisely.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And the appropriation has been made—

Mr. MANN. And has been fixed by law for the next fiscal year.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The appropriation has been made to the extent of the law, and there can not be any deficiency.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman, it seems to me, fails to realize what the rule provides.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, no; I do not.

Mr. CANNON. Very well. I disagree with the gentleman. This amendment is authorized by the special rule. The original proposition is not authorized by law. It seems to me it is perfectly plain that the very object of the rule was to enable us to consider this amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee, notwithstanding that it is not authorized by law. Very true this is not authorized by law, but it provides by this amendment to affect the same employees that are affected by the original amendment as offered by the gentleman from Tennessee. I do not know that it is necessary, if I may be indulged for a moment, to show the propriety of this amendment. If without amendment the gentleman from Tennessee succeeds in having the amendment agreed to, the increase of pay to the employees does not begin until the 1st of July next. God knows what the price of wheat, corn, and meats will be on the 1st day of July. We do not know when the war in Europe will close. It may be that the salaries proposed by the amendment by the gentleman from Tennessee will buy 25 or 50 per cent more of the necessities of life than the salaries would buy during the remainder of this fiscal year.

In my judgment, the rule makes this amendment in order. And even without the rule I believe this amendment to be germane. It treats of the same parties and the same officials that the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] covers.

Mr. MANN and Mr. BENNET rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is recognized.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee, of course, is only under the special rule, and would not be in order, as the Chair rules, to strike out of the bill because it is an appropriation not authorized by law. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] provides for an increase in the compensation during the fiscal year 1918. If an item in the bill in some place provided for an appropriation for the fiscal year 1918 for a particular officer who was authorized by law, and there was a deficiency for this year, it would be in order to offer an amendment on this bill.

Now, the other appropriating committees frequently bring in bills providing that appropriations shall be immediately available. That language is always subject to a point of order because the other appropriating committees do not have jurisdiction over deficiencies, but the Committee on Appropriations does have jurisdiction over deficiencies, and an item making immediately available an appropriation carried in one of the bills reported from the Appropriations Committee, offered by the gentleman from Tennessee. I think it proper to call the attention of the Chair to the rule and also to a colloquy which took place in the House when the rule was proposed.

When the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] reported this rule from the Committee on Rules I asked him the distinct question whether an amendment of this character would be in order under the rule reported from that committee. Of course, while his opinion does not control the Chair, still it was upon his statement that the House acted. He said that such an amendment under the rule would be in order. I call the attention of the Chair to the rule:

Resolved, That no amendment shall be in order in the consideration of the foregoing amendment changing existing law beyond the fiscal year 1918.

Is the Committee on Rules trying to fool the House—I think not—by bringing in a rule stating that no amendment shall be in order beyond the fiscal year 1918? Are they endeavoring to fool the House into the belief that under that an amendment would be in order providing for any time between now and the end of the fiscal year 1918? I do not believe the Committee on Rules would be guilty of endeavoring to fool the House by bringing in such a rule. Here is a rule reported from the committee and adopted by the House which provides that no amend-

ment shall be in order relating to the time after June 30, 1918. Certainly that, by implication, provides that an amendment any time prior to that time would be in order, as expressly stated by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY], who reported the rule. But the amendment is germane. If a similar item had been in the bill relating to the next fiscal year, any deficiency relating to the item would be in order on this bill or any other bill reported from the Committee on Appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to hear the gentleman from Mississippi. [Laughter.]

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, after the remark which the Chairman just made, it is very much like the justice of the peace, who by vocation was a blacksmith, who heard all the testimony in a case, and told the lawyers who had examined the witnesses, "Now, you have a pretty good crowd here. Get up now and make your argument. I have got to go and do some work. Open up this drawer and you will find my written judgment. Do not lose this opportunity to make a speech."

So, inasmuch as the Chair has stated that he is ready to rule, I am rather in that attitude. Of course, there is no intimation as to which side of the question he is to rule on, and the gentleman now addressing the Chair is also in this unfortunate position, namely, that the gentleman occupying the Chair is a member of the Committee on Rules which reported the bill, and perhaps is in a better situation to understand what the Rules Committee had in mind at that time.

But I wanted to call the Chair's attention to the fact that this whole resolution provides for appropriation for a certain fiscal year. There is no item in the bill, no item in the amendment now offered, except for the fiscal year which is specifically set forth in the resolution, stating that this rule is for the purpose of making an item for the year, which the committee offered for the year 1918, in order. There is nothing in the rule, no line or syllable in the rule or in the body of the resolution, that provides for any other year than the fiscal year 1918.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman seriously contend that there is nothing in this bill applying to any fiscal year except the fiscal year 1918?

Mr. SISSON. Nothing in this rule, I say. In other words, if you take the wording of the rule—

Mr. MANN. What the gentleman said was "the bill."

Mr. SISSON. But take the rule—

Mr. MANN. I was speaking of the bill.

Mr. SISSON. The rule applies to the bill. The language of the rule is this—

Mr. MANN. I understand.

Mr. SISSON. I understand, but since the gentleman raised the question, I wanted him to understand what is in my own mind. It says:

That to provide during the fiscal year 1918 for increased compensation at the rate of 10 per cent per annum to employees who receive salaries at a rate of compensation less than \$1,200.

That is for the year 1918. The resolving portion of the resolution, on page 2, limits it so that you can not get beyond the year 1918. But the appropriation here—

Mr. MANN. We are observing that, too.

Mr. SISSON. But the appropriation here in this bill does not cover the item for 1917. We are legislating only for 1918. Now, you might put upon this bill, if you please, items providing for salaries and fix the salaries, if you please, but it would be germane for all time to come until that salary was changed; but you are not doing that now. The only thing we are doing is making provisions for the salaries that shall be drawn during the year 1918. That is the specific appropriation. Now, the fact that you say that you shall not go beyond 1918 is a limitation only as to the future. It does not in anywise affect the law which this bill affects, to wit, that of appropriations commencing for the year 1918, and making appropriations for the year 1918 the rule only contemplates it would not go beyond the year 1918, and can not antedate that year. That is my contention under the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that the object of the special rule is to provide for these increases for certain classes of employees for the fiscal year 1918, and that if the proviso in the special rule cited by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], namely—

Resolved, That no amendment shall be in order in the consideration of the foregoing amendment changing existing law beyond the fiscal year 1918, nor shall any amendment be in order relating to the compensation of employees not appropriated for in H. R. 18542—

were not in the special rule, an amendment would not be in order that would have extended it beyond the fiscal year 1918. It would not, in that event, be germane to this section. There

is quite a difference, in the opinion of the Chair, between an amendment making an appropriation immediately available and in an amendment that provides for increasing the appropriation during the remainder of the year 1917. The Chair can not agree with the argument of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that there is any deficiency to be taken care of in this amendment. It proposes, on the other hand, to increase an appropriation and change existing law. The amendment, in the opinion of the Chair, is not germane to the provision and sustains the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois appeals from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the committee?

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers. I do that so that the Chair will not be put to the embarrassment of counting.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman from Illinois asks for tellers.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GLASS). The gentleman from Illinois asks for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. MANN and Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee to act as tellers.

The committee divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 96, noes 79.

The CHAIRMAN. The decision of the Chair is sustained. [Applause.]

Mr. KEATING and Mr. BORLAND rose.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HARRISON). The gentleman from Missouri is a member of the committee. The gentleman from Colorado will be recognized later.

Mr. KEATING. I had the assurance of the Chair, as the Chair knows, that I would be recognized, and I feel under all the circumstances that the Chair should make good on the proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that under the practice here the members of the committee will have the prior right.

Mr. KEATING. Is it possible, Mr. Chairman, that when a Member has been struggling for the floor for the better part of an hour a member of the committee, who has an eleventh-hour inspiration, can come in and take him off the floor? Can the thing continue without limit?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would state to the gentleman that it does seem to be unfair, but he will recognize the gentleman in a moment.

Mr. Sisson. I believe it is the rule of the committee and not simply a practice.

Mr. BORLAND. It is not in the discretion of the Chair. I offer an amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BORLAND: Page 142, line 18, after the word "employees," insert the words "including the Capitol police and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the point of order is well taken, because the rule under which the original amendment was offered provides that it shall extend only to employees covered by this bill. An amendment which included employees not covered by this bill would be subject to a point of order, but these employees are covered in this bill, and in no other bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman this question: Are these employees that the gentleman proposes to include in this section provided for in this bill?

Mr. BORLAND. They are provided for in this bill. There is no question about that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to hear the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered simply applies to the employees covered in the bill. I think it is specifically stated in the rule that it shall apply only "to the employees of the Library of Congress, the Botanic Garden, and the executive and judicial establishments who are appropriated for in this act specifically and under lump sums or whose employment is authorized herein." The rule reported

by the Committee on Rules and adopted by the House provides—

That no amendment shall be in order in the consideration of the foregoing amendment changing existing law beyond the fiscal year 1918, nor shall any amendment be in order relating to the compensation of employees not appropriated for in H. R. 18542.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I only want to say this, that it seems to me that the same reasoning which applies to a raise of 10 per cent to employees drawing less than \$1,200, on account of living conditions here in Washington or on account of living conditions throughout the country at the present time, would apply with the same force to the employees of the House, with the same force to the Capitol police, and to the watchmen and doorkeepers and others who must live here in Washington and under the same conditions of living.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. These employees covered in the amendment will all have a vacation from the 4th of March until the 15th of December on half pay.

A MEMBER. Full pay.

Mr. GORDON. That is so much worse. Why do you say this would apply to these clerks in Washington that would apply to these appointees?

Mr. BORLAND. I will answer the gentleman. This bill is for the fiscal year 1918. It has nothing to do with the 4th of March. It goes into operation on the 1st day of July, 1917. It embraces the long session of Congress, beginning in December, 1917, and extending probably, as we know, during the balance of that fiscal year. During the time from the 1st of July until the convening of Congress most of these employees will be engaged. A large number of them certainly will be engaged. The men in the folding room, the men in the various clerical offices here, the Capitol police, all of them will be engaged. There will be scarcely any vacation, and so far as I am able to ascertain, the expenses of these men in going back and forth to and from their homes for a short vacation are a part of their expenses, and they do not get any opportunity to engage in other business. The vacation, in other words, does not result in any addition to their pay.

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BORLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SIMS. Does this amendment cover those employees in the House Office Building who are under the Superintendent of the Capitol, who are carried on the pay rolls of the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. BORLAND. I intended that it should cover them.

Mr. SIMS. It ought to.

Mr. BORLAND. And if the gentleman is not clear about it, let him offer an amendment to cover it.

Mr. SIMS. Oh, I want the gentleman to cover it.

Mr. BORLAND. My impression is that the description "employees of the House and Senate" embraces them all.

Mr. SIMS. These gentlemen to whom I refer are on the pay roll of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. BORLAND. If they are on the pay roll of the Secretary of the Interior they are embraced in the main proposition. Now, what we are trying to embrace is those who are not on the pay rolls of any of the executive departments, but who are on the pay rolls of the legislative department.

Mr. SIMS. That is my understanding.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island. Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I agree with the gentleman from Missouri, and I want to ask him if his amendment includes the folders in the House Office Building?

Mr. BORLAND. It does. It covers all of these low-paid employees.

Mr. BURNETT. Will it include the messengers to committees?

Mr. BORLAND. I think so.

Mr. BURNETT. I think it is very just that they should be included. I have a messenger who gets only \$60 a month, a white man, a very competent man, and I am going to lose him unless something is done to increase his salary.

Mr. BORLAND. That only emphasizes what I have to say. It is a question of simple justice. I concur with the committee in believing that if we give an increase at all in the pay of the great army of Government employees, we ought to be very moderate in the increase. We ought not to be swept off our feet by some proposition to increase them 25 or 33 per cent, or some such increase that we can not justify according to the increase of industrial wages throughout the country; but when

we give an increase of even 10 per cent, I think we ought to be perfectly uniform about it, and I think it ought to embrace all the employees who receive these low salaries, and whose conditions of employment are similar. Therefore, I think we ought to adopt this, in common fairness, if we adopt any provision increasing the salaries of employees.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Is the gentleman absolutely certain that under his amendment all would be included?

Mr. BORLAND. I am not absolutely certain, but I would like to make it certain that the increase would be uniform.

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] proposes to offer an amendment which would make that absolutely certain. This bill divides itself into various branches under the titles "Legislative," "Executive," and "Judicial."

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee uses the language "executive and judicial establishments." If you add "legislative," then you include everybody covered by the bill; but when you attempt to cut out the general term "legislative" and to specify certain things, I do not know whether you cover them all or not. The gentleman from Pennsylvania proposes to offer an amendment to strike out the words "Library of Congress, the Botanic Garden, and the" and to insert "legislative," so that it would apply to the employees of the legislative, executive, and judicial establishments who are appropriated for in this bill. That covers everybody whose salaries come within the limits covered by the proposition.

Mr. BORLAND. If the gentleman will yield, I suppose it would be a good thing to say that this increase shall apply to all employees appropriated for in this act.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. You will find on the second page of the bill the heading "Legislative." That covers every appropriation for the legislative establishment of the Government. You will find on page 28 the heading "Executive." That covers all the appropriations for the executive establishments of the Government. You will find on page 137 the heading "Judicial." That is the heading that covers all the appropriations under the judicial establishment, and the three combined cover all. Now, that is a simpler way to do it, I think, and not leave it a matter of construction as to whether certain employees under the Superintendent of the Capitol are covered, and so forth.

Mr. BORLAND. Would that cover the Capitol police?

Mr. MANN. They are all appropriated for under the legislative establishment.

Mr. BORLAND. I personally have no objection to that amendment. I want to cover exactly what the gentleman from Illinois has outlined. I think we ought to make this raise uniform within those limits of salary.

Mr. MANN. I think whatever we do to-day ought to apply to all the employees of the Government, here and elsewhere.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will yield, I wish to ask him whether he has any objection to accepting an amendment, which I shall send to the desk to be read for information. The idea is to cover all of those that would be affected by the bill.

Mr. BORLAND. I will yield to the gentleman.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Pages 142 and 143, after the words "employees of the," in line 24, strike out the words "Library of Congress, the Botanic Garden, and the" and insert in lieu thereof the word "legislative."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That would make it comprehensive and cover everyone that is to be covered in this bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Would not that be broad enough to cover the various committees of the House and the Senate and the clerks of Members whose compensation has already been increased?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It covers all those receiving not more than \$1,800 and not less than \$1,200.

Mr. BARKLEY. It covers employees whose compensation has been increased under previous action.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think not; it would apply as in other cases.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The clerks to Members are not employed under the legislative establishment, but are the employees of Members. Mr. BARKLEY. But it would cover clerks to committees.

Mr. MANN. Undoubtedly.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask leave to modify my amendment on the lines suggested and carefully analyzed by the clerk of the committee. I want to move to amend so as to strike out the words in line 24, page 142, after the word "employees," extending down to the word "establishment," in line 2, page 140. That strikes out all reference to the Library of Congress, Botanic Garden, executive, and judicial. And it would read: "Provided, That this section shall only apply to the employees who are appropriated for in this act specifically and under lump sums or whose employment is authorized therein." That amendment is absolutely clear.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That covers everybody intended to be covered in the executive and judicial departments?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; it covers what the gentleman has in mind.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BORLAND: Pages 142 and 143, after the word "employees," in line 24, page 142, strike out the words "of the Library of Congress, the Botanic Garden, and the executive and judicial establishments," so as to make the line read as follows: "This section shall apply only to the employees who are appropriated for in this act specifically and under lump sums," etc.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the committee should understand why the employees of the Senate and House were not included in the recommendation by the Committee on Appropriations. It was due to the fact that the compensation of employees of the two Houses of Congress is not only liberal but very generous and much in excess of that paid for similar services in any department of the Government or in private life. An employee who is engaged in the business of operating an elevator in the Capitol or the House Office Building receives \$1,200 a year. In private establishments in the city they receive \$60 a month, and \$720 a year as a rule in the executive departments of the Government. The page boys employed on the floor of the House receive \$75 a month. Compensation for other services is on a similar scale.

I do not criticize the scale, because it is something inherent in the conduct of legislative bodies. The employment is not of a permanent character; it is what may be termed somewhat hazardous in that it is apt to terminate unexpectedly and without much notice. And so the custom exists in every legislative body of the United States to compensate upon a generous scale their employees. When it is proposed to give an increase to take care of temporary conditions those facts can not be ignored.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. The salaries for the employees around the Capitol have been carried for a number of years at practically the same amount?

Mr. FITZGERALD. A great many of them.

Mr. MANN. Congress having now acted on the idea that these salaries were proper at that time, if an emergency does exist does not the emergency hit these employees just as hard as it does any other employees?

Mr. FITZGERALD. They are as well off relatively and much better off than anybody else relatively.

Mr. MANN. Considering the fact that many will go out in the cold before long, does not the gentleman think that this should apply to them?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not think that many will go out at the close of this Congress. It is a matter that affects Members on this side of the House by whom they are appointed. If any of the employees of the Capitol are dissatisfied because of the compensation they are receiving and no longer desire the places, if I am given an opportunity I can bring a regiment of applicants, competent persons, who are not only willing but very anxious to fill the places. What I have said, Mr. Chairman, is simply in explanation of the action of the committee in eliminating these employees. It was the desire of the committee to try and meet as far as could be the needs of employees of the Government under existing conditions.

Consideration had to be given to many things. I have just had a computation made by competent persons, and their estimate is that if a provision similar to the one carried in this bill is incorporated in every appropriation bill it will require \$25,000,000 to meet the added expense to the Government. It seems to me that that is as far as we are justified in going under the present circumstances. While I am willing to be

just, I am not willing to be lavish in attempting to take care of the situation.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I received a letter this morning which seems to me to contain a most effective argument in favor of the general proposition properly to increase the wages of Government employees. This letter was written by the postmaster in a city of about 15,000 people in my district, and, with the permission of the House, I shall now read it:

DECEMBER 16, 1916.

MY DEAR Mr. COOPER: I wish to write you about a circumstance that has happened here and the condition that exists. We have here at this building a janitor who receives \$55 per month. He is 55 years of age and has a family. He is a handy man, is a pretty fair mechanic. He does many odd jobs of repairs that if he did not do would cost the Government a considerable amount to have done. He has had sickness in his family, and has been ailing himself because of a nervous disorder, induced, I think, by his financial condition. Yesterday he would have destroyed himself had the gun which he was about to use not been taken away from him—

Mr. Chairman, I ask for order. It is true that this is merely the case of a janitor who is being paid \$55 a month; but, nevertheless, he is entitled to have his case presented here inasmuch as he is only one of quite a large class of Government employees who are trying to exist—forced to exist—in these times of extravagant prices on what are practically starvation wages. For the benefit of gentlemen who apparently did not wish to hear the letter I shall repeat some of what I have read:

Yesterday he would have destroyed himself had the gun which he was about to use not been taken away from him. This man can not reasonably support himself, or even support himself at all, on \$55 a month.

I do not write you to urge any legislation, but simply to acquaint you with a condition that exists here and, I think, in many other places.

As a citizen I have to say that, in my judgment, the Government ought to pay a living wage to even its most humble employees, and, further, in my judgment, such legislation ought to be enacted as would permit or require the payment in these times of high prices of a larger amount to janitors.

I beg to remain,

Yours, very sincerely,

Then follows the signature of the postmaster.

This is the richest Government in the world, Mr. Chairman, and in times like these it is not justified in compelling an employee with wife and children dependent upon him for support, for whom he is obliged to buy food and fuel and clothing and to pay physicians, as this sick man has been, to try to exist on \$55 per month. Gentlemen have repeatedly said that the Government must be just before it is generous. Mr. Chairman, it must be just before it is niggardly. [Applause.] I have not a constituent, I am thankful to say, but who, if it should become necessary for the Government to raise money by bonds in order properly to pay janitors in these times, will not consent to the issue of bonds.

As I have before said on this floor, the Government ought not to determine its duty by what private employers sometimes do in the matter of wages, but it ought to make itself a model employer, as it is abundantly able to do, and always pay all of its employees a living wage. [Applause.]

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] and now under discussion may or may not be understood clearly by the membership of the House. The purpose of the amendment is to include in this increase of pay the employees of the two branches of Congress; no one else. Every other person appropriated for in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill is provided for in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS]. I want to call the attention particularly of the majority side of this House to the fact that these men hold their positions largely as patronage at their hands. They are paid a wage sufficient to induce them, many of them, to come from your districts to the Capital to accept this job. There is not a single man of you who has one of these places at your disposal who can not to-day fill the place of any man you have named five times over by men who are beseeching you for the place. [Applause.] And yet you stand here seriously considering squandering the public money in order that these men who work little more than half the time, may have a bonus paid to them on a wage that they are not only glad to have, but that 40 other men are standing at your elbow to take away from them, if you shall designate them.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. I will ask the gentleman whether that is not exactly true of every other employee in the bill whose pay is raised? Is not that exactly the fact in the case of all these employees?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Except that possibly the person out of employment who would take the place of the employee in the Government service can not take it because of the civil-service obstacle that is in his way; but that is not true in the case of these employees.

Mr. BORLAND. Is there not a big civil-service waiting list now?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Oh, certainly; and I might argue that, in support of the moderate increase that has been provided in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee. I have no hesitation in saying, and it can be proven by the most reliable figures that have been tabulated in respect to a comparison between the wages paid clerical employees by the Government and those salaries paid in private employment for like service, and in every instance a fair comparison will show that the very people for whom we are providing an increase of 5 or 10 per cent under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee are receiving greater pay than are men who are performing not only a like service but who work much longer hours in private employment.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] alludes to the "richest Government on earth." How long would we be so if we pursued the course marked out by some gentlemen? The gentleman is consistently willing that we should increase these wages, even if we issue bonds to meet the increased amount. This is temporary, but we must pay for it by additional taxation.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I can not yield just now.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman wants to be fair?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I want to be fair.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I feared it possible that the gentleman might put that construction upon my remarks. I limited that specifically to the increased wages of janitors.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. It would not take many bonds to do that.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I said my constituents, if they had to do it in order to pay these poor men more than \$55 a month—

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I accept the gentleman's statement, because I value the time more than my statement. I want to say this one thing further in connection with this matter: Other gentlemen have alluded to this as being the "richest Government on earth." You can not get your money except out of the people by taxation, and I want to say there are gentlemen in this House, some on this side and more on the other side, who have voted for every expenditure that has been proposed, but who refused to vote for the bill raising the amount necessary to pay it, and I say that in good faith, whatever may be your political affiliation, you can not afford to vote obligations upon the Government and then refuse to vote for the money that is necessary to pay them; and that is what you are doing here in this proposition. [Applause.]

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I belong to that committee which is charged with the duty of suggesting bills to this House to pay the tremendous expenses of this Government. The London Economist five or six weeks ago contained a most interesting article estimating the amount of the budgets of the warring nations after the present awful war is ended. If the war ends one year from the 1st of next March, England will have an annual budget thereafter of \$1,200,000,000, according to this publication. Germany will have a budget of \$1,300,000,000; Austria-Hungary will have a budget of \$1,400,000,000; Russia, with a budget always the largest in the world, will have a budget of \$1,600,000,000. I wonder if gentlemen who compose this body realize that for the year mentioned by the London Economist, for the fiscal year 1918, the expenses of this Government—and we have been in no war—will be \$1,655,000,000, the largest budget in all the world, a larger budget than any nation in the world was ever compelled to meet. Increase the salaries of all these Government employees 10 per cent and you add to the expenses of this Government \$60,000,000 every year. How are you going to meet it? The cry all over this country is, "Cut out the 'pork'!" and by "pork" they mean appropriations for public buildings; by "pork" they mean appropriations for rivers and harbors; by "pork" they mean appropriations for this Government's distribution of vegetable seed, and that is all. The average annual expenditure for public buildings for the last two decades amounted to \$9,000,000. We spend \$25,000,000 or \$30,000,000 on rivers and harbors every year. Cut this out, cut both out, cut out the \$250,000 which is expended for vegetable

seed each year and you would have half of what these 500,000 Government employees are seeking to saddle on this country. I am not willing to see our rivers and harbors permitted to fill up nor to discontinue entirely the expenditure of money for Government buildings in order that Government employees may have their demands on the Treasury satisfied. The real pork-barrel propositions with which this country is confronted are the demands of these Government employees on the Treasury. We have a deficiency staring us in the face. Gentlemen need not deny it.

The deficiency in 1918 will amount to nearly \$280,000,000. How are you gentlemen going to meet that when the time comes? Is the country going dry? Those who advocate nation-wide prohibition are boasting of the fact that Pennsylvania and Nevada are now the only really wet States in the Union. I am not discussing the moral question, but I am discussing the condition which will confront us when this country does go dry. If that should happen during the next year—an impossible premise, though—we will be called upon by taxation to collect from some source or other \$237,000,000 more in money each year thereafter. In other words, we are confronted right now in this country with the possibility of being compelled in the near future to levy more than \$500,000,000 of new taxes. How are you going to do it? Restore the rates of the Payne-Aldrich bill? That is the proposal many of you make. You can not, to save your life, frame a tariff bill which will yield over \$350,000,000 a year. Restore those oppressive rates and you will add to the present tariff law \$100,000,000 in tariff taxes. If you restore this obnoxious stamp tax, you have only \$33,000,000 more. Can you get it from taxing the large incomes more? Why, you have in this method of taxing reached the very highest notch. We tax large incomes now as much as any other civilized nation in the world ever attempted to tax them in time of peace. You are face to face with the necessity of lowering the income exemption—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York that the gentleman from Illinois proceed for five minutes? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RAINEY. We are face to face with the proposition of lowering the income exemption to \$1,000, and even if you do that also you will not raise this enormous sum of money. You can not progress here by proceeding along the line of least resistance. You can not conceal your head in the sand and flounder around here helplessly listening to the demands of 500,000 Government employees who want their salaries raised.

I wish we could raise their salaries. I wish we could pay everybody more money. I wish this janitor mentioned by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Cooper] could get more money than he is receiving now. Is he getting any more or any less than janitors receive for similar service in other sections of this country and in private employment? If he is getting less, he ought to have more; if he is getting more, he ought to have less. That is the way to adjust these matters. How much is he getting? He is getting \$55 a month, perhaps also apartments in which to live, with the tips that go with services of that kind in a great city—\$600 per year. That is not a large amount, but it is \$100 more than the average rate of wages paid in the gentleman's district, the gentleman who suggests now the monstrous proposition that we issue bonds for the purpose of paying the current expenses of this Government in order that these salaries may be raised.

Mr. SIMS. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIMS. I fully agree with what the gentleman says, but is it not a fact that the estimates for military and naval expenditures this year are \$300,000,000 more than they were last year?

Mr. RAINEY. That is exactly true.

Mr. SIMS. And all the world talking peace and permanent peace.

Mr. RAINEY. And when we discuss lowering those expenditures for the Army and Navy, from every metropolitan paper in this country comes the charge that we are guilty of treason against this Government. You can not lower those estimates.

Mr. DALLINGER. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois if he did not vote on the fish hatcheries bill—

Mr. RAINEY. Yes; I did.

Mr. DALLINGER (continuing). Carrying \$800,000?

Mr. RAINEY. I voted for the fish hatcheries bill. They add largely to the wealth of this country. I voted for those hatch-

eries because they help provide food for the 100,000,000 people who live in this country. [Applause.] We have one river in Illinois which, under the fish-hatchery system conducted there, yields every year per acre for all the land in its bed which is covered with water, \$15. Is not that an industry worthy of being taken care of? Is any private individual going to hatch out fish and turn them out for fishermen to catch, when they mature, in our streams in order to reduce the high cost of living in this country?

These Government positions do not go begging. Last year we had 185,000 applicants for these places. Six times as many people took every examination as there were jobs to distribute. They are desirable places. I wish it were possible to pay them more money. I wish it were possible to pay every wage earner in this country more money—every man who works upon a small salary more money. In this country there are 6,600,000 men who work all day long amid clanking machinery, in the close air of great factories, who received on an average in 1909—the last year for which reliable statistics are available—\$519 per year. If their salaries have been increased since then by 20 per cent, which is hardly possible, they would get less now than this janitor gets. The farmers of this country who produce foodstuffs for this Nation enjoy an average income of less than \$600 per year, and that includes what their wives and children are able by their labor to contribute.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. RAINEY. May I have five minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAINEY. Employees here in the District of Columbia work seven and a half hours a day, some of them, and some of them work eight hours a day—none of them more than that—and they receive an average compensation of \$1,200 per year. Two millions of these wage earners in our factories, who get an average wage of less than \$600 per year, work over 10 hours a day, and only 500,000 of them work 8 hours or less. The remaining 6,100,000 work 10 hours and more than that every day.

How much time are they allowed each year on full pay for sick leave? They do not get 30 days. How much time are they allowed for vacations on full pay? They do not get 30 days. All these Government employees get 30 days' sick leave and 30 days' vacation on full pay all the time. These Government positions are desirable ones. They are sought after. You need not fear that they are not going to be filled. The humanitarian side of the question, of course, appeals to all of us. We would like to give them more money if we could, but this money in the Treasury does not belong to us. The Republican side usually votes for every charge on the Treasury, and gets enough votes on the Democratic side to carry it through. The money you are spending does not belong to you. It belongs to the 100,000,000 people who are being taxed to place it there. It does not flutter down from heaven to fill up these vaults of the Treasury. It is there as a result of a system of taxation. We are not here for the purpose of generously giving it away. We are here as trustees of this enormous fund for the people who sent us here, to protect their rights, and not to give it away to Government employees who want their salaries increased. The time has not come to increase salaries, as many gentlemen in this House think they ought to be increased. But the time will come when everyone of us will be compelled to go home and face our constituents. You can not escape responsibility because you sit on that side of this aisle and say that we on this side are responsible because we have control of this House, and Democrats can not escape responsibility, either. This trust fund must be administered conscientiously and not given away. Of course, these employees want their salaries raised. We know they do. They hold every day meetings in this city, here where \$46,000,000 in Government funds are distributed every year in salaries, here where there are 42,000 Government employees. They hold their meetings here every day, creating a public sentiment, a tremendous sentiment among themselves, for this increase. And it is announced that a petition to contain 500,000 names is about to be presented to this Congress, asking that we boost these salaries until we make an additional charge on the Treasury on account of this subject alone of \$60,000,000 per year.

Already here in this committee—and I am unwilling to believe the propositions will ever pass the House—you have increased your allowances. You have given yourselves session stenographers at \$75 a month, and you have increased your allowance for clerical hire to \$2,000. You insist these additions are necessary, because you have to pay some of these expenses out of your pockets. Of course we all do that. But those of you

who represent country districts, how many third-class postmasters have you got who do not pay something out of the pittance that the Government gives them to conduct the Government's business and employ additional help in their offices? Why, nearly every one of them does, and we are not here demanding that their allowances be increased. And if you increase your allowances here you will simply take the lid off the Treasury of the United States and invite every Government employee to come in here and help himself.

The time has come when the taxpayers of this country, the men who meet these enormous burdens, ought to be consulted. Every day bill after bill is introduced into this House for the purpose of getting money out of the Treasury. But I can count on the fingers of one hand the bills which Members introduce here in a whole session of Congress for the purpose of getting money into the Treasury. What we need in this country is some method of getting money into the Treasury, not so many heroic, patriotic methods of getting money out. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I can not quite agree with all of the argument of my colleague [Mr. RAINEY] against the Byrns amendment. I think the Byrns amendment ought to be agreed to, and that the pending amendment ought also to be agreed to.

Just for a moment let us see what the situation is in the country. Since the war in Europe began we have imported more than a thousand million dollars of gold. That of itself would add considerably to the cost of articles and help very materially to make prosperity in the country, because no country in the history of the world ever yet has imported great quantities of gold without prosperous times following the importation. We are exporting immense quantities of munitions of war, foodstuffs, cotton, and so forth, at very high prices, at prices which benefit us, so far as the Nation is concerned, because they are prices which are paid by the foreigner for the articles which we export. The result is that the country is enjoying prosperous conditions; business is doing well; labor is in demand. There is almost an extravagant riot of speculation going on in some parts of the country as the result of these prosperous conditions. But the very result hits most people in the country hard. A few enjoy the splendid benefits of the prosperity, but the man who works for a salary finds that if he had a steady job before, the prosperity of the country ruins his personal prosperity. Instead of all receiving the benefit, those who work are at a disadvantage unless their wages be enlarged.

Most of the private companies and persons who are employers in the land have either willingly or unwillingly been required to advance the wages of their employees. The demand for labor itself would cause that, whether the employers desired it or not. Many of the large corporations have, in addition to raising the wages of their employees, given a bonus at the end of the year or at the end of some time to their employees.

Now, we stand in a peculiar position. It is dependent upon us whether we will at all increase the compensation of Government employees, or whether we will determine that the prosperity which may come to all other people in the country shall be calamity to those who are employed in the service of the Government of the United States. [Applause.] That is what we have to determine. They can not receive the benefit of the prosperity except through our influence. Shall we make it a calamity to them because it spells prosperity to everybody else?

I take it that whatever we do on this bill ought to be followed on the other appropriating bills providing for governmental service. Whatever rate we fix here we ought to fix in other bills, providing for the same classes of service with the same increase of pay. If we do not increase compensation here on this bill, we ought not to increase compensation on the other bills. If we add 10 per cent here to the pay of those who receive less than \$1,200 a year, we ought to add 10 per cent to all the other Government employees, because the calamity or the prosperity is not coextensive with the limits of the District of Columbia. The same conditions exist throughout the Union. We must determine now, in order not to play favorites, whether we will increase and to what extent we will increase the pay of Government employees; and we ought to carry that through the various other appropriations which are to come.

Now, I fail to understand the reasoning of those gentlemen who believe that we ought to increase the pay of everybody in the Government service below a certain salary except those that we personally know, who do the personal work for us in the House and the official work here; that we ought to increase the pay of all the Government clerks in Washington and the Government clerks in the post offices and other branches of the Government service throughout the Union everywhere, ex-

cept the janitor who does the work in our own employ. I fail to understand that reasoning. If we are to be generous—I do not say generous, because I do not think we ought to be generous—but, in any event, if we would be reasonably just, then we ought to apply that to those who work for us here as well as the others, and not draw the line.

I do not believe that we ought to make a great increase in the pay. I commend the committee, which, having a very difficult task before it, finally brought in the proposition which was brought in. I am inclined to think at present that the percentage of increase they propose may be a proper percentage for us to follow all through the Government service. I do not favor extravagant appropriations. We may have the burden on this side before long—probably will [applause on the Republican side]—of raising the money. We know that the other side has always proved incompetent to transact such business. [Applause on the Republican side.] We know that they do not know how to raise money for the Government. We believe that if we have the power we will have the knowledge and the statesmanship to do it properly. I think we will have, and that we can afford to be just to those who work for the Government, as much so as to those who work for private employers, and that we ought here to determine a reasonable increase in pay and apply it to all employees of the Government in the classes covered as we may cover them in any proposition that we may adopt here and now. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, there are other amendments to follow, and I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon the pending amendment be now closed.

Mr. AUSTIN. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. AUSTIN. I have been trying all the morning to get the Chairman's eye, and I object to closing the debate on this amendment until I have had an opportunity to discuss it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. To my certain knowledge the gentleman has an amendment which I know he proposes to offer a little later.

Mr. AUSTIN. I have been on my feet very often, trying to get recognition all the morning, and I do not propose to be cut off.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that there are several gentlemen trying to get recognition, but he can not recognize them all at the same time. He is doing the best he can.

Mr. KEATING. Can we not dispose of the Borland amendment?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think we ought to dispose of this amendment and then take up the main proposition. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon the pending amendment be closed in 10 minutes, 5 minutes to go to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] and 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that debate upon this amendment be limited to 10 minutes, 5 of which shall be allotted to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] and 5 to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I want to address myself for a few minutes to the manner in which we can raise this needed money, in answer to the argument of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY].

Just prior to the adjournment of the last session of Congress two speeches were made on this floor when the revenue bill was under consideration, one by the Speaker of this House and the other by the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Ways and Means. As I now recall the speech made by Speaker CLARK he stated that he had served on the Ways and Means Committee for 15 or 16 years, and that he could take the schedules in the tariff bill and write a tariff measure which would produce a sufficient amount of money to meet all the Government requirements. The ranking Republican member of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. FORDNEY] stated during the same debate that if the Payne-Aldrich tariff rates were now in force, with the present large importations of foreign goods into this country we would collect enough money at our customhouses to meet all the running expenses of the National Government without a resort to direct taxation.

Our present tariff duties average about 10 per cent, the lowest in the world. If you double the existing tariff rates you can raise a sufficient amount of money to take care of all these appropriation bills. So there is your remedy and your method for meeting this proposed increase in salaries.

We have not had a rearrangement or readjustment or general increase in Government salaries for half a century. We

have increased the salaries of the judges of the Supreme Court, we have increased the salaries of every United States circuit and district judge, we have increased the salaries of the President and the members of the Cabinet. Ten years ago, on account of the increase in the cost of living, the Members of this House increased their own salaries 50 per cent. The United States Steel Corporation has already increased the wages of its 200,000 employees to the extent of \$30,000,000, and on Saturday last the American Bell Telephone Co. announced an increase of \$3,000,000 for its employees. Other corporations throughout the country have increased wages. Everybody admits the increased cost of living. What fair, just, and reasonable argument can be made against increasing the salaries of the efficient and deserving Government officials? Why, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEX] in a 15-minute speech argued against the increase of Government salaries, and yet when the eight-hour proposition was before this House last session, which, according to the officials of the railroad companies, meant an increase in wages of 25 per cent, he voted for it. If that increase is to be met, freight rates will be advanced, and in the end the people are to pay for the increase.

This increase reported by the Committee on Appropriations is a delusion and a snare. It means a daily increase of 21 cents for a \$1,600 clerk, a daily increase of 18 cents for a \$1,400 clerk, 20 cents a day for a \$900 clerk, 25 cents a day for a messenger at \$840, and 21 cents a day increase for an assistant engineer, a watchman, or janitor, or skilled laborer. For a fireman on a salary of \$660 it means a daily increase of 19 cents; for a messenger at \$600 a year, 18 cents a day; for a charwoman at \$360 a year 10 cents a day; and for one at \$240 a year, 7 cents a day. The last increase will pay the price of a loaf of bread.

The weekly increase of a clerk at \$1,600 a year will be \$1.50 a week or \$6 a month. For a \$1,400 clerk it will mean a weekly increase of \$1.25, or a monthly increase of \$5. For a \$900 clerk it will mean a weekly increase of \$1.87, a monthly increase of \$7.50. For an \$840 messenger it will mean a weekly increase of \$1.75 and a monthly increase of \$7. For an assistant engineer, a watchman, a janitor, a skilled laborer, all receiving the same wage, it will mean a weekly increase of \$1.50, a monthly increase of \$6. For a fireman paid \$660 annually it will mean a monthly increase of \$5.50 or a weekly increase of \$1.37, while a \$600 messenger will get a monthly raise of \$5 or a weekly increase of \$1.25. A charwoman paid \$360 would obtain a monthly advance of \$3 or 75 cents per week. The lowest-paid charwoman, who now receives \$240 for a year's work, will get the magnificent increase of \$2 per month or 50 cents per week.

I have worked out this proposed increase under the pending bill to show that this so-called salary increase to meet the high cost of living is practically a delusion, and would be a reflection rather than a credit on this great lawmaking body in doing its duty toward the honest, capable, deserving officials of this great Government. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the time. I will say what I want to say later.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee) there were—ayes 75, noes 61.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I ask for tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee and Mr. BORLAND.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 121, noes 65.

Accordingly the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. KEATING: On page 142, after the word "of," in the eighteenth line, strike out "10" and insert "20"; and, in line 20, strike out the figure "5" and insert "10."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if it is possible to limit the debate upon this amendment? How much time does the gentleman from Colorado want?

Mr. KEATING. I want about 15 minutes, but there are several gentlemen here who want to discuss it, I imagine.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all time on the pending amendment be limited to 40 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. That is not sufficient. If the gentleman will bear with me, this involves an increase in rates.

Mr. MANN. But there may be somebody else that may propose an increase of rates, and we ought to get through with this bill to-day.

Mr. KEATING. Oh, we will get through with it.

Mr. MANN. Not at this rate.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Then, Mr. Chairman, I will ask that all time on the pending amendment be limited to one hour.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment be limited to one hour. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I think a word with regard to the origin of this amendment would be in order at the very beginning. This amendment was agreed upon by a committee representing the various organizations into which the Federal employees have grouped themselves, working in conjunction with a volunteer committee of Members of Congress, of which the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VAN DYKE] was chairman. The effect of the amendment is to increase the wages of employees who are receiving less than \$1,200 20 per cent, and to increase the wages of those receiving from \$1,200 up to \$1,800 10 per cent, and it provides no increase for those who receive wages above \$1,800.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. Was the committee that met and determined the action that the House will take composed of Members of Congress or unofficial persons?

Mr. KEATING. I will say to the gentleman from Ohio that he may possess his soul in peace. No body of citizens presumed to meet and dictate the action of this House, but a committee representing the Federal employees met, as they had a perfect right to do, and suggested to Congress and the Members thereof certain increases of salary rendered necessary by a state of affairs well known to exist.

Mr. GORDON. The gentleman said they agreed on this schedule.

Mr. KEATING. They agreed upon it, and I agreed upon it; but I did not attempt to bind the gentleman from Ohio. I would not assume to do that.

Mr. GORDON. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. KEATING. The amendment doubles the rates provided for in the amendment submitted by the Committee on Appropriations. Let me repeat: The 20 per cent increase is for employees who draw salaries up to but not including \$1,200, and 10 per cent from \$1,200 up to and including \$1,800, but no increase beyond \$1,800.

Mr. EVANS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I will.

Mr. EVANS. Ten per cent on a salary of \$1,700 is an increase of \$170. That carries the salary above \$1,800.

Mr. KEATING. The increase would include a salary of \$1,800, but would not apply to any salary which at the time of the passage of the law was above \$1,800.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. A clerk receiving \$1,100 gets an increase of 20 per cent, and he would receive more than the clerk who receives \$1,200 would get by an increase of 10 per cent.

Mr. KEATING. I have no doubt that here and there such results would be achieved, but I think in any method of percentage increase you may adopt you can work out such results. Only a few will be affected.

Now, as to the amendment, it increases the salaries for one year, the fiscal year of 1918. It does not increase the salaries for 1917 or 1919.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I have 15 minutes.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman is mistaken, Mr. Chairman. The time was limited to an hour and left in control of the Chair. I would be glad if the gentleman from Colorado gets additional time, but I do not want the Chair to be misled.

Mr. KEATING. I did not intend to mislead the Chair.

Mr. SHERLEY. Of course not.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the time of the gentleman from Colorado be extended 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SAUNDERS). The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Colorado be extended 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. The increase applies to the year 1918 and not to any other year. The need for the increase is just as urgent for 1917 as it will be for 1918, and therefore if you grant this increase you are practically granting a bonus covering two years—1917 and 1918.

Now, I wish to quote from a report by the Secretary of Commerce, his last annual report, to show the need of this increase. The Secretary says:

The following compilation has interest in connection with the facts relating to the cost of living of Government employees in Washington. The present scale of wages for clerks in the Government service, grouping them into four classes and fixing a salary of \$1,800, \$1,600, \$1,400, and \$1,200, respectively, per annum for each of these classes, was fixed by the act of Congress approved April 22, 1854 (10 Stat., 276; sec. 167, Rev. Stat.), and has not been changed since that time. For the subclerical grades the rates of compensation were fixed by the acts of Congress approved July 23, 1866 (14 Stat., 207; sec. 167, Rev. Stat.), and July 12, 1860 (14 Stat., 250; sec. 160, Rev. Stat.).

For 60 years the rates of compensation to clerks have remained stationary and for about 46 years to the subclerical grades. The available figures on file in the Bureau of Labor Statistics, based upon wages in selected industries, all of which, however, were not uniform for the entire period covered, but which can be accepted as typical, show an increase in daily average wage of 137.4 per cent from 1854 to 1915. In other words, daily wages in 1915 were 24 times as much as in 1854. These figures were taken from Senate Report No. 1394, Fifty-second Congress, second session, Report of Senate Finance Committee on Wholesale Prices, Wages, and Transportation, which, on page 176, gives the average wage increase to 1891; Bulletin No. 77 of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which, on page 7, gives the average wage scale from 1891 to 1907; and Bulletin No. 194 of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which, on page 20, gives the average wage scale from 1907 to 1915.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I wish to call attention to the fact that there have been changes in this way—that places at higher salaries have been created which people have been put into that were formerly not in the \$1,800 class. The Secretary did not know that fact when he incorporated those remarks into his report.

Mr. KEATING. Clerks have been promoted from one grade to another, I know. The Secretary's statement does not mean that a clerk who went into the service in 1854 is to-day, if he is in the service, at the same salary.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not mean that. What I mean is that there have been places created at salaries of \$2,000, \$2,200, and \$2,250 which are occupied by men who formerly never received more than \$1,800.

Mr. KEATING. I am glad to have the explanation. Now, the Secretary goes on and gives some interesting figures on the increase in cost of living during that same period:

The reports on cost of living show that for the same period, 1854 to 1915, the increase has been 14.1 per cent. These figures are based on wholesale prices, and it is a fair assumption that the retail-price increases will very closely approximate those of the wholesale-price increases. Bringing the price figures up to the latest date for which they are available, the month of September, 1916, by using figures relating to retail prices of food, the increase over 1854 is 32.4 per cent. In other words, the increase from the average for 1915, to September 15, 1916, in price of food commodities as a group is greater than the increase of the average price for the whole period from 1854 to 1915. The increase during the nine months ended September 15, 1916, over the average price for the year 1915 is approximately 16 per cent.

For the last few years the figures showing wage increases are based on the union wage scale. It is a well-known fact that in many industries to-day wages in excess of the union scale are being paid.

Interesting in connection with this study are some pertinent figures shown by the General Review of Crop Conditions on October 1, 1916, issued by the Bureau of Crop Estimates of the Department of Agriculture. From this report it appears that the index figure of prices paid to the producers of the United States for principal crops on October 1, 1916, is about 27.6 per cent higher than a year ago, 19.9 per cent higher than two years ago, and 23.8 per cent higher than the average of the last eight years on the same date. This report shows that the corn crop is estimated to be 11 per cent below the yield of last year; wheat, 40 per cent; oats, 20 per cent; barley, 22 per cent; rye, 15 per cent; white potatoes, 16 per cent; and apples, 14 per cent. The index figures of meat animals on September 15, 1916, show prices paid to producers of about 23.7 per cent higher than the figures of a year ago; 10.5 per cent higher than two years ago; and 2.5 per cent higher than the average of the last six years on the same date. All these facts point to a still higher charge for food supplies.

Rather startling are the figures compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics relative to wheat and flour for the period from May to September, 1916. The report on this subject shows that the average retail price of flour increased from \$7.62 per barrel in May, 1916, to \$9.39 per barrel in September, 1916, and press reports since that time indicate that the retail price of flour has gone to \$12 per barrel.

From the above statements it clearly appears that wages in all branches of industries have more than kept pace with the increased cost of living, but that no increase has been made in the wage scale of Government employees, notwithstanding the fact that since 1854 the daily task of all wage earners has been steadily decreasing, while the Government employee has received increased hours, with no consequent increase in compensation to offset, in a measure, the increased living cost.

That living costs in the last few years have gone up to an unprecedented extent is not shown by Government reports alone. The Annalist states that in the year ended September 30, 1916, the increase in a selected group of commodities, arranged to represent a theoretical family's food budget, has gone from 135 to 185, or an increase of about 37 per cent. The percentage of increase in food commodities shown by the Annalist compares with the official figures of the Bureau of Labor Statistics compiled to June 30, 1916.

The Secretary assumes that the cost of living increased from 1854 to 1915, 14.1 per cent, and from 1915 until his latest estimate was made, which was September 15, 1916, the increase

was 16 per cent. In other words, according to the Secretary, the increase in the cost of living in the period covering a little more than a year, during these war times, was greater than the increase in cost of living from 1854 to 1915. I think the Secretary's figures on the increase in the cost of living are ultra-conservative. I believe they are entirely too low, but they demonstrate that the increase in wages which I suggest is anything but radical.

I want to call the attention of the House to another official report. The other day we increased the appropriation for the Children's Bureau, very properly so. One of the most interesting reports submitted by the Children's Bureau has to do with infant mortality in Johnstown, Pa., and Manchester, N. H., and deals particularly with the effect of high wages upon infant mortality. Of the babies with fathers earning less than \$450 a year, 1 in 4 died, while, in that same vicinity, where the fathers earned more than \$1,050 per year only 1 baby in 16 died.

I call attention to the fact that there are scores and hundreds of fathers in the Government service earning \$450 a year. We want to increase their wages, but we are also seeking to increase the wages of the fathers who earn \$1,050 a year.

This report goes on to point out that where the mother has to go out to work the increase in infant mortality is startling, and, of course, where the father fails to earn a living wage the mother must assist in making up the deficit. I might give the figures, if time permitted, but it is sufficient to know that when you deprive the father of a living wage you crush the life out of the baby. I want now to quote another great governmental authority upon the effect of increased wages upon the health and happiness of a people. I suppose the most famous authority on sanitation in the world is Surg. Gen. Gorgas, of the Army. In an address delivered before the fifteenth annual conference of health officers in New York City, and issued by the American Medical Association, Gen. Gorgas makes this statement concerning the results achieved at Panama:

The eradication of yellow fever and the control of certain other diseases at Habana and Panama was undoubtedly due to the special sanitary measures taken against these diseases. But these special features could have no effect on the general health conditions. For the last 15 years I have given a great deal of thought to this matter. What did we do to cause the great general improvement in health conditions which took place shortly after our arrival at both places, and which has since continued?

At Panama, shortly after our arrival, we increased the wages of the common laborer from 11 cents an hour to 20 cents an hour. This was nearly four times the wages of the laborer in the surrounding countries.

If we paid the citizen of a foreign country four times the wages he got at home, we naturally had to increase largely the pay of American citizens whom we wished to get to come to the Isthmus. This caused a steady increase in wages all along the line.

This large increase of wages caused a great general improvement in all living conditions—more room to live in, better food, and better clothing. I am satisfied that to this improvement in social conditions, caused by our high wages, we owe principally our extraordinary improvement in general health conditions.

It is a health officer's duty to urge forward these measures in his community which will control individual diseases; but my long experience has taught me that it is still more his duty to take that broader view of life which goes to the root of bad hygiene and do what he can to elevate the general social conditions of his community. This, my experience has taught me, can best be accomplished by increasing wages. Such measures tend at the same time to alleviate the poverty, misery, and suffering which are occurring among the poorest classes everywhere in modern communities.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. I want to call attention to the fact that \$1,800 is the lowest salary not affected by the gentleman's amendment, but in case the salary is \$1,700 a year the amendment would so affect it that the \$1,700 man would receive \$70 more than the \$1,800 man.

Mr. KEATING. The \$1,800 man receives an increase under this amendment.

Mr. LANGLEY. And there is no such salary as \$1,700.

Mr. KEATING. I presume not. The fact is that you may imagine a situation where some clerk now in a lower grade would be given a higher salary than a clerk now in a higher grade, but I do not believe it would work out in that way.

The practical effect would be that the poor fellow down below the \$1,200 limit would get a 20 per cent increase, and I do not think it is sufficient in many instances. I wish we could make a much greater advance in the salaries of those who might be referred to as the "submerged" portion of the Government employees—the poor devils referred to by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER], the men who are drawing \$40 and \$50 and \$55 per month; and the unfortunate charwomen, who scrub the floors of our public buildings for the munificent remuneration of \$240 a year.

Some gentleman asks why they retain these positions, why can not they quit, why can they not go and get another job? There is no particular reason why they can not quit, except the

fear that clutches the heart of men who know that if they give up one job they may not be able to secure another job. That is the reason they do not throw up these positions.

It is no answer to an argument for an increase in salary to say that you can get another man to take the place of the poor fellow who is receiving a salary that will not sustain life. So far as this Government is concerned, it should lay down the rule that every employee must have a living wage. [Applause.]

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations embraced section 6 in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill proposing an increase of 10 per cent in salaries of all Government employees whose salaries are less than \$1,200 per year and an increase of 5 per cent of all salaries from \$1,200 to \$1,800 per annum. The proposed amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] proposes an increase of 20 per cent on all salaries below \$1,200 per annum and an increase of 10 per cent on all salaries between \$1,200 and \$1,800 per annum.

The Committee of the Whole House the other day increased the salaries of clerks to Members from \$1,500 to \$2,000 per year. This discussion has taken rather a wide latitude on the question of increases of salaries at this time. At this time, in addition to later registering my vote against it, I want to protest against the amendment increasing the salaries of clerks to Members from \$1,500 to \$2,000 per year. There is no doubt about the proposition that 95 per cent of the private secretaries of every one of us are now getting more money than they can get in private establishments to save their lives. If not, why are they here? Why are they willing to sacrifice their time and energy in working for us when they could get better and higher salaries by working for private institutions?

The Committee of the Whole House recently incorporated in this bill a provision voting an additional clerk at the rate of \$75 per month during the time Congress is in session. I am equally opposed to this. I do not believe Members can justify themselves in voting for either of these propositions. I do not believe they will do it when it comes to a yea-and-nay vote on these two propositions. This proposed increase in salaries of private secretaries from \$1,500 to \$2,000 per year, additional stenographers at the rate of \$75 per month while Congress is in session, together with the proposed increase of salaries of all clerks up to \$1,800 per year, appropriated for in this bill, and working in the city of Washington or elsewhere may well be characterized as a "salary grab" pure and simple. This is all it is, and it should be looked upon and treated as such by those who must finally pay the bill, as well as those who receive the proposed benefits.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard many Members upon the floor of the House time and time again talk about the poor, unfortunate farmer, saying he is the man who bears the burden of taxation, and I quite agree with them on this proposition, and later I will demonstrate the truth of these statements and then see whether or not the friends of the farmer, when the roll is called upon all these increases in salaries, will vote as they have talked.

I have heard it stated on the floor of the House time and time again that the Government should be a "model employer." No one has undertaken to define what the phrase "model employer" means. Does it mean that the Government as an employer should pay higher wages than private employers? If this is what those mean who use the phrase, then they are answered, because the Government does pay its employees much higher wages than the private employer. This is answered by the facts in the case; beyond question our Government pays to its employees much higher salaries than any other Government upon the face of the earth pays to its employees. The salary of our Government employee ranges from 25 to 50 per cent per year higher than the salaries paid by any other Government to their employees. I make this statement after due and careful investigation from books and reports found on file in the library.

Without fear of successful contradiction, I undertake to say that the Government pays from 15 to 30 per cent higher wages to its employees than is paid private employees. Take the salary paid to our private secretaries—\$1,500 per year. Thousands upon thousands of traveling men now traveling for private employers do not get as much as \$1,500 per year. Thousands upon thousands of bright, active young attorneys, graduates of our leading law colleges, are now receiving less than \$1,500 per year. Thousands upon thousands of bright, active young men, graduates of medical schools, now receive less than this sum per annum. Yesterday, coming up on the car from the Treasury Department, I asked the conductor how much he was paid. He answered me, "From 23 to 27 cents per hour,

working 10 hours per day." The conductor and the motorman must work in the open, exposed to all kinds of inclement weather, and work day and night, without a single day's lay-off in the whole 365 days in each year.

All the clerks and employees working for the Government in the city of Washington have 30 days' leave of absence with full pay each year. In addition, they have 30 days' sick leave of absence with full pay. They have a full Saturday afternoon off during the months of June, July, August, and part of September. They have seven full holidays with pay. All told, the employees working for the Government in the city of Washington work approximately 257 days out of the 313 working days of the year. These same employees here in the city of Washington are now moving heaven and earth, bringing all pressure they can upon the President to get him by an Executive order to establish the half holiday all the year round with full pay. Not so with the private employee working in the city of Washington. He does not get 30 days' leave with full pay or 30 days' sick leave with full pay or his half holiday. He must put in 313 days per year, less the seven national holidays.

I want to briefly quote from a farmers' bulletin which I have, for the benefit of my farmer friends of the House whom I have heard talking so long and so loud and so pitifully, bewailing the unfortunate condition of those living in the country.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I can not yield. I would if I had time. I would be glad to do so. It is Farmers' Bulletin 746. On page 6 of the bulletin, under the title "Earnings of different classes of workers," "annual average for farmers, cash, farm supplies, \$600." This means the income earned by the farmer and his family. The family averages five persons. This would mean an average income for each member of the farmers' family of \$120 per year, an exceedingly small amount. Mark you, that out of this \$600 earned by the farmer and his family he must buy his supplies, keep his family, pay his taxes, insurance, doctor bills, and all the usual expense connected with the keeping of a family. The farmer knows no holidays except Sunday. He and his family work each day in the year at something. He does not observe the eight-hour day, but works from daylight until dark. He has no 30 days' leave of absence with pay, no 30 days' sick leave of absence with pay. He has no Saturday afternoons off for three months in the year. He is the man who with his family is compelled to work in the open, in the rain, sleet, snow, and sunshine under any and all conditions favorable or unfavorable.

The Government employees in the city of Washington, including our private secretaries, at least 90 per cent of them work in the most favorable conditions seven hours per day in splendidly equipped Government buildings, well lighted, heated, ventilated, with sanitary conditions as nearly perfect as possible. I trust my farmer friends will remember these conditions when they come to vote upon the proposed increase of salaries, when they come to vote upon this salary-grab measure.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GORDON). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. HOPWOOD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will that interfere with those of us who desire to be heard upon this question if this five minutes be granted?

Mr. COX. Not on the other side.

Mr. HOPWOOD. I am on the other side, and therefore will not object.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no objections, the gentleman can proceed.

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Again quoting from the farmers' bulletin:

Wage earners on street railways, \$674 per year; in iron and steel works, \$610 per year; in factories, \$460 per year; in telephone companies, \$438 per year.

SALARIED EMPLOYEES.

In factories, \$1,188; on street railways, \$1,122; patrolmen, \$1,052; Federal employees, \$948; in telephone companies, \$843; clergymen, \$663.

As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] so well and forcibly stated a moment ago, there are not less than 4,000,000 wage earners in the country to-day drawing the small salary of \$470 per year. There are upward of five and one-half million wage earners and toilers who earn less than \$600 per year. Enough? No! I wish it were possible for private employers to increase all the salaries of their employees, but I presume that a majority of the employers of labor in this country are paying to their employees all they can afford to pay. The news-

papers of the city of Washington, day in and day out since Congress convened, have waged an unrelenting fight for the increase of salaries of Government employees. I undertake to say that many of the employees of the newspapers here in the city of Washington are getting far less than the lowest paid employee working for the Government. In my opinion it would be quite interesting reading, as well as instructive and entertaining, if these newspapers would publish the names of all of their employees and the salaries paid each. Why do not they do it? The merchants, bankers, hotel people, restaurant men, and all others in the city have enlisted in this fight to increase the salaries of clerks in the Government, and yet it is conceded that employees here in Washington are getting from 20 to 50 per cent higher salaries than these same people are paying to their employees in private life.

Since returning to Washington I had occasion to go up on an elevator in one of the largest hotels in the city. I asked the elevator man what wages he was drawing and how many hours he was required to work. He replied, "Thirty-five dollars per month, with hours ranging from 8 to 10 and 12." I recently went up on an elevator in one of the large department stores here in the city and asked the elevator man the same question. He answered me "he was getting \$30 per month, and working from 8 to 12 hours per day," while the Government pays its elevator men \$720 per year for 8 hours' labor, and if the subject could be properly investigated this would be substantially true in all the various occupations of labor here in the District; but it is to the financial interests of the newspapers, the merchants, bankers, hotel and restaurant men, and others living in the city to get the salaries of these clerks increased, because it means more money to them, more money will be expended in the city. Yet they do not pay one cent of the additional taxes imposed upon the people because of these proposed increased salaries, not a penny. Every cent of this additional increase will be paid by the people of the United States. Their interest in seeking to have the salaries increased is not a human interest but a selfish interest. Their agitation for an increase of salary is designed solely to benefit themselves without regard to the burden it will impose upon those who pay the taxes.

Mr. TEMPLE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COX. I can not yield.

Mr. TEMPLE. I would just like to know the date of that bulletin?

Mr. COX. It is dated July 6, 1916. Those who care to carefully investigate the subject of salaries paid by our Government as compared to the salaries paid by other governments will find that we are paying approximately 50 per cent higher salaries to our employees than any other government pays. Those who care to investigate and who will take time to investigate the salaries paid by the Government to its employees with the salaries paid by private establishments to their employees in the same identical line of work will find that the Government is paying its employees upon an average from 15 to 30 per cent higher wages than private employers pay.

Briefly, I want to call the attention of the House to a bulletin issued by the Bureau of Education, No. 31, issued in 1915. On page 18 of the bulletin will be found a compilation of salaries paid by both private and public institutions, as follows:

RURAL TEACHERS, FARM LABORERS, AND RURAL MAIL CARRIERS.

The average annual wage of farm laborers in 1913 was \$257. The average for rural school-teachers appears to range only slightly higher—exact figures are not obtainable. It is interesting to compare with these two classes of workers the rural mail carriers, who receive an average salary of \$1,115. In Alabama the figure for male farm laborers was \$173 in 1913, while rural mail carriers received \$1,052; the average salary for all teachers in the State for 1914—including teachers in the large cities—was \$446 for male and \$369 for female, while for rural teachers in two counties selected at random it was \$310. In Arkansas the counties selected reported \$273 as the average annual salary of teachers, male farm laborers average \$204, and mail carriers on rural routes \$1,043. California, one of the best-paying States for teachers, shows \$804 for teachers in two counties, as compared with \$421 for farm laborers and \$1,046 for rural carriers. Colorado pays \$309 to farm laborers, \$1,060 to rural mail carriers, and \$306 to teachers in independent districts. The rural counties in Connecticut pay an average of \$449—not quite half the pay of the mail men. Iowa pays her rural teachers in at least two counties less than farm laborers—\$326 as compared with \$368; rural mail carriers in this State average \$1,081. Massachusetts averages \$455 to rural teachers for four counties; male farm laborers receive \$306, and rural mail carriers \$1,031. North Carolina (26 counties) paid her rural teachers an average of \$160, as compared with \$191 for farm labor, and \$1,034 for rural mail carriers. In Oregon, on the other hand, teachers are paid an average of \$605 (two counties), as compared with \$372 for male farm labor and \$1,056 for rural mail carriers. In Pennsylvania the average teacher's salary for the entire State is \$744 for males and \$550 for females, as compared with \$1,057 for rural mail carriers. In Tennessee (46 counties) the average salary for rural teachers was \$223, as compared with \$190 for male farm laborers, and \$1,051 for rural mail carriers.

Mr. Chairman, this bulletin is very interesting, especially when considered in the light of the argument made by the

advocates for increased salaries to Government clerks. It establishes the fact beyond peradventure that Government clerks and Government employees are paid out of all proportion above private employees or other kinds of public employment. This bulletin asserts that the average annual wage of farm laborers in 1913 was \$237 in the United States, and that the average for rural-school teachers appears to range only slightly higher.

In Alabama the average price paid to farm laborers was \$173 in 1913. The average salary for all school-teachers in the State of Alabama for 1914 was \$446 for male teachers and \$369 for female teachers, while the average price paid to rural-route carriers was \$1,052.

In Arkansas the average wage paid farm laborers was \$204, and the average wage paid to school-teachers in counties reporting was \$273, while the average salary paid to rural carriers was \$1,043.

Take North Carolina. In 26 counties the average paid to her rural-school teachers was \$160 and the average paid her farm laborers was \$191, while the average paid the rural-route carriers was \$1,034. Take the great State of Massachusetts, noted for its progress and intellectual activities as well as humane-ness. The average paid to rural-school teachers was \$455 and to farm laborers \$306, and the average paid to rural-route carriers was \$1,031. These figures are very significant, if not startling. These figures meet and refute the argument of those who contend that Government employees are underpaid as compared to private employees. It requires a great deal more study, more knowledge, more information on the part of school-teachers to equip themselves for their profession and to enable them to secure a license to teach school than is required of the average civil-service employee before they can successfully stand a civil-service examination. I adhere to the doctrine and commend the argument that the Government should be a model employer. I insist it is a model employer in each one and all of its departments. It pays its employees higher than any other employer; its employees work shorter hours than 90 per cent of other employees. Its employees are better housed, work in better sanitary conditions than private employees. Its employees have more holidays with full pay than any other class of employees in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a pleasant task for me to assume; but if I interpret my duty aright as a Representative of the people, I must stand on the one hand between those who are to receive, and on the other between those who must pay the bills. I must stand between those who are to receive the benefits on the one hand and those who must have their taxes increased in order to pay these benefits on the other.

I must be just before I am generous. I can not be just to those who pay the tax, and at the same time vote millions out of the Treasury, every dollar of which must be raised by taxation in some form. I may be wrong in my sense of duty; I may not see things from the proper viewpoint, but my sense of duty and my viewpoint compels me to take a stand with the already overburdened taxpayers of the Nation who are crying out on every hand against the onerous increased burden of taxes.

Many thousands of bills are introduced every session of Congress to take money out of the Treasury which mean taxes, and a very small number of bills are introduced proposing to put money in the Treasury. Mr. Chairman, if all these proposed increases in salary to Government clerks and employees and private secretaries go through, and become law, and the same provision proposing similar increases of Government salaries are placed on other appropriation bills, it will mean a charge upon the Treasury of not less than \$25,000,000 for the ensuing fiscal year. The price is too high for me to pay. I refuse to vote it.

I am willing to pay the debt, and take the consequences whatever may befall me politically or otherwise. The Secretary of the Treasury informs Congress that in 1918 there will be no escaping a Treasury deficit of \$300,000,000. This means that we have got to issue Government bonds or cast about and find some other thing or piece of property on which to place a tax. Instead of constantly increasing the burdens of taxation the wise thing to do, the just thing to do, the economic thing to do is for Congress to cease making so many useless appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, I concede that the cost of living is high, but we should remember that the high cost of living is hitting the wage earners, the toilers, the farmers; in fact, everybody just as hard and just as severe as it is hitting Government employees, and it is unfair to impose a tax upon those underpaid private and public establishments in order to increase the salaries of Government employees upon any ground, legally or morally. It will not be defended by the taxpayers when they come to vote in the next election. They will hold Members of Congress responsible for it, as they ought to.

This proposed increase of salary to Government employees and the proposed increase of salary of our private secretaries should meet a stern defeat when the roll is called upon these measures. I shall vote against it and abide the judgment of the people who have commissioned me to represent them in Congress. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. SHERLEY having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment joint resolution of the following title:

H. J. Res. 324. Joint resolution authorizing payment of the salaries of officers and employees of Congress for December, 1916.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill H. R. 8092, entitled "An act confirming patents heretofore issued to certain Indians in the State of Washington," disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. PIRMAN, Mr. LANE, and Mr. CLAPP as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. HOPWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I favor the amendment offered increasing the wages 10 and 20 per cent instead of 5 and 10 per cent, and my reason is briefly this: That in every other department of industry in our country the wages have already been increased more than that. In the coke regions in Pennsylvania wages have been increased. I cut a clipping yesterday out of a local paper to this effect, namely, that there had been a 10 per cent increase for 40,000 men in the coke region. This 10 per cent comes upon two other increases during the past year—one last February of 10 per cent, one later on, I think in July, of 5 per cent, and now another of 10 per cent, making 25, or, rather, by taking the percentages on the preceding percentages, making 27 per cent of increase during the year.

Now, one of the gentlemen who was arguing against this matter said that "we must take into consideration the men back home." The men back home are making more money than they ever made before, because of the peculiar conditions at this time, and they have been making that sort of money for the past two years, while the man on salary, either in the Government employ of any other employ, unless his salary has been raised, is the worst-fixed man in this country to-day. The prosperity instead of benefiting him is detrimental. Without any increase in salary, he is compelled to pay from 60 to 100 per cent more for living expenses.

I cut another clipping from the same paper, which is headed "\$108.89 two weeks' pay."

It says:

Talking of fat pay envelopes—

Says a news item from Connellsville on Monday—

coal miners are particularly favored these days. Semimonthly pays of \$80, \$90, to \$100 are not uncommon. Some are faring even better. At Davidson plant of the H. C. Frick Coke Co. August Fink last week drew \$108.89 for his two weeks' work. To do this he loaded one hundred and twenty-one 40-bushel wagons, mined all his own coal by use of a pick, and set his own timbers. At Coalbrook William Richey mined and loaded 137 wagons of 37 bushels each, his pay amounting to \$102.13. At neither plant are machines used for mining. Recently two workers at Trotter made big records for a day's work, but this was for loading only, the mining being done by machine.

So, when you talk about taking care of people back home, they are being taken care of a great deal better than we are taking care of the Government employees. The great corporations of the country, when prosperity comes to them and when prices are advanced for their product, always automatically raise the wages of their employees. But the Government seems to have adopted a flat rate of pay, paying men so much per month or per year, and they pay it year after year, good times and bad, high prices or low, whether living costs 100 per cent more now than it did when the wages were fixed. It pays them the same wage now as it did 40 or 50 years ago when the present scale was adopted. It is a ridiculous and an outrageous thing to do.

They talk about the farmer getting \$600 a year only. He is getting nearly \$2 a bushel for his wheat. He is getting 60 or 80 per cent more than he ever was getting before—more than when that 1909 schedule was made up that was referred to by one of the opponents of this advance. In riding over my county one day recently I was with a man who had 700 bushels of potatoes to sell, and he said, "What do you think I was offered for my potatoes?" I said, "I do not know." He said, "One

dollar and seventy-five cents at my barn." That is about 75 cents more than he ever was paid for them before.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPWOOD. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. In what part of the wheat-raising section of this country are the farmers getting anything near \$2 a bushel for wheat?

Mr. HOPWOOD. I do not know what they are getting. I know the market prices. There is no doubt he is getting well up to that, because the farmer is smart enough these days to get all that is coming to him.

Mr. SLOAN. On what market is wheat \$2 a bushel now?

Mr. HOPWOOD. It was close to \$2.

Mr. SLOAN. It was; but in the market at Chicago it is only \$1.60 after you carry it to Chicago.

Mr. HOPWOOD. Do not you people in the West get pretty near that at your own market?

Mr. SLOAN. Oh, no; there are some freight rates.

Mr. HOPWOOD. I think it is selling in Pennsylvania at the mills at about the market quotation. They may have better markets than you have in the West.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. HOPWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I heartily agree with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] "that no increase should be made that can not be justified by the general increase in wages throughout the country." I have indicated the increase of about 27 per cent in my own district in the pay of the employees of the coal and coke companies. This increase has also been made in the wages of the employees of the iron and steel works of our country.

The farm laborer and the common laborer in the towns and cities of our land have also received increased wages in many instances of at least 50 per cent within the past two years. I venture to say that the general increase throughout the country in all lines of industry will average more than 20 per cent in the past two years. I also venture the assertion that the increase in cost of keeping a family within the last two years is much more than 20 per cent.

The advance, therefore, as contemplated by the amendment of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] is justifiable and right, not only from the standpoint of the general increase in wages throughout the country but also from the high cost of living that causes every man with a family many anxious hours to solve the problems that confront him as to how he is to give to those he loves the common necessities and comforts of life.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, at this time, when there is a perfect deluge of bills for increasing salaries, it appears to me there ought to be some consideration given to the state of the Treasury. No one of these gentlemen, so far as I know, who have offered these various bills for increases, has even attempted to tell the House how much they would cost if carried through all the various departments or even through the particular departments that are now under consideration. Nor have they ventured to think, apparently, about the ways and means for raising the necessary funds to pay these bureau expenses. How many gentlemen in the House have considered that for this fiscal year there will be a deficit of \$103,000,000 according to the report of the Secretary of the Treasury?

That is based on the supposition that the National Guard will be withdrawn from the Mexican border on the 1st of January, and no one expects that such action will be taken. We have to-day in the Treasury only about \$45,000,000 if we exclude the amount placed to the credit of the disbursing officers, which is no part of the free balance in the Treasury. This balance in the Treasury is melting away at a rate exceeding \$20,000,000 a month.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow an interruption right there?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. If you exclude the subsidiary coin and the bullion that is provided for coinage, you would have only about \$30,000,000 in the Treasury to-day?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes. They aggregate something between \$10,000,000 and \$15,000,000, and that would leave nearly that amount. Of course, the great bulk of the income and corporation taxes will not be paid until June of next year, and at that time there will be a balance.

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. FOCHT. Will the gentleman explain why that money is not there? And if it is not there, how it can be put there, so that we can pay this increase of salaries? Both can be done. You know why it is not there, and you know that it can be provided for. We all know that it can be provided for.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Well, the gentleman can tell that in his own time. I am talking about the condition of the Treasury. Before the income tax and the corporation tax come in we will either have to issue bonds or run the Treasury on trust funds, one or the other. We must use money that we ought not to use or issue bonds.

Gentlemen who have stated the condition of the Treasury on the Democratic side have been altogether too conservative in their statements. The deficit will be nearer \$150,000,000 if we continue the same military expense for the remainder of the fiscal year, and the report of the Secretary of the Treasury shows that if we do not increase taxation for the next fiscal year—the year ending June 30, 1918—the expenditures will exceed the receipts more than \$300,000,000. That is in addition to the fact that we will be more than \$100,000,000 behind in our balance at the beginning of the fiscal year 1918.

The gentleman who just asked me to yield seems to think it is easy to raise these vast sums that are necessary to put our Treasury in a good condition, in a condition where it would not be obliged to use trust funds or where the Government would not be obliged to issue bonds. Perhaps some gentlemen can tell us just how it can be done. I do not know at this time how it can be raised, and I doubt whether any other gentleman does. We can not go into the business of lifting ourselves over the fence by our boot straps by taxing men who have incomes amounting to only \$1,500 a year in order to pay somebody in the Government employ an additional sum. We could probably raise \$100,000,000 on the tariff. We could put perhaps 50 cents more on the tax on beer and 15 cents more on the tax on distilled liquors, and together we could get \$50,000,000 from those two sources. But still we would not have enough, and other methods must be used besides taxes on luxuries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I am compelled to oppose the amendment of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING], not because I do not personally feel that I would like to increase the salaries of all wage earners, but in a spirit of justice both to the wage earners who are not employed by the Federal Government and those who happen to be employed by the Federal Government. We must look at this from one standpoint, and that is the particular point that I want to press in upon you in the brief time that is allotted to me.

Whatever raise we adopt in this bill we must in all fairness make uniform throughout the Government service. We can not defend a raise for the clerks in the executive departments in Washington that we could not defend for the civil-service employees in other great centers of the country or employees of the Government here in the Capitol. There is no peculiar condition applying to these men in the executive departments that does not apply all over the country, and it was for that reason that I offered the amendment a short time ago, extending this raise recommended by the committee to all of the employees included in this bill. We must have a raise, if we have one, which is not only uniform but which we are in a position to defend.

I have received petitions from post-office clerks in my district, where I think there are in the neighborhood of 1,000 or 1,200 post-office employees, asking for raises in their salaries. I know that the maximum salary in the post offices among clerks and carriers is \$1,200 a year. For railway mail clerks it goes up to \$1,600. But the maximum salary for post-office employees is \$1,200. I know that the conditions affecting their employment are precisely the conditions affecting employment here, with the exception that they work longer hours and more days in a year. There are 478,000 civil-service employees in the United States. This bill appropriates for about 8 per cent of that whole number. But whatever principle we adopt in this bill, we ought in fairness to carry it out to the other civil-service employees, and I for one am not willing to vote for the increase of any special class of Government employees that I would not be willing to extend to another class of Government employees similarly situated.

That is the whole situation here. To extend the raise recommended by the Appropriations Committee to the Government employees situated as these are would cost from \$40,000,000 to \$50,000,000. To extend it as proposed by the gentleman from Colorado would cost approximately \$130,000,000. I do not personally think that there is a justification for a 20 per cent increase of wages. I heard these arguments made here

when my amendment was under consideration, that there are thousands of men trying to crowd into the Government service. I have no doubt it is true. Even in these prosperous times, when labor is at a premium, there are still thousands of men trying to crowd into the Government service, indicating that the Government service is not a hardship and is not underpaid and is not undesirable.

Therefore if we make an increase for these men we ought not to give a cent more than the committee has recommended—a 10 per cent increase under \$1,200 and a 5 per cent increase between \$1,200 and \$1,800. And then we must make up our minds that that same rate of increase ought to be carried out to the men who do not happen to be employed in the city of Washington in the same spirit of justice that we would give it to the men who happen to be employed here. Unless we can defend a raise for all of the civil-service employees, 478,000 of them, we can not defend a raise for any of them; for I will undertake to say that the conditions of living in the city of Washington are not as high in many respects as they are in some of the western and coast cities of the United States. And I will undertake to say that the conditions of employment here are better in many respects than they are in many cities throughout the Union. I will undertake to say that there are a large number of employees here in the District of Columbia who are engaged in outside business, running printing offices, stores, truck gardens, delivery wagons, automobile liverys, and all sorts of things all over the District of Columbia, because of the short hours and the small number of days in the year that they are compelled to work for the Government. But the civil-service employee in the great Postal Service of the United States has no such opportunity. We must have a raise which will apply equally to all men similarly situated.

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this economy preached by some of the gentlemen on the other side of the House when it comes to paying men wages that they may live on is very far-fetched when we go back to the preceding session of this present Congress and remember the tremendous expenditures that they voted for at all times without any excuse. Among them there was one useless item of expenditure that would have been sufficient to pay the employees of the United States the increased wages that they ought to have ten times over. That was the armor-plate factory, a thing passed without any excuse except that the poor figurers, the committeemen on the other side of the House, said that they did not know what the price of armor plate was, therefore they ought to build a factory and find out, at an expense of \$11,000,000 to the people of the United States. And that is not half what the expense will be when the building is put up and the works is going, and by that time we will in all probability not need any armor plate, as it will be obsolete.

Those things are brought in and put forward as a wonderful expense account, and they say, "Oh, we can not afford this added expense to pay wages to employees. Why, the exchequer now is short. We have not got enough money to buy these armor-plate factories. Therefore the individual who works for the Government and keeps it running must starve." That is about the conclusion you come to. I am for this advance in wages all along the line to these employees.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARLAND. No; I will not yield. I have only five minutes. I am for this advance all along the line, because it is satisfactory to those to whom it applies, and I think that is a very good reason. That reason was sufficient here a short time ago, when we were voting on something which the President of the United States insisted upon in the House—the Adamson bill. The people back of it were satisfied, and that was the only real reason and excuse offered, and in this case it is identically the same.

Some one here compared the rates of wages paid in Washington on the street cars. Then the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] brought in a pamphlet showing wages 5, 6, 8, and 10 years ago. He quoted those old wage scales to show you what wages are now. My friends, there has been a mighty change within the last year. The big corporations of this country, those that hire the most men, have raised wages three times, 10 per cent each time, an advance of 32 per cent. Yet you are coming in here and hesitating about giving these poor fellows this increase. I will say to you clearly that I do not think this is enough for them. I think the increase should have been 20 per cent and 15 per cent, and then 10 per cent above \$1,800.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. GARLAND. No; I will not yield.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not blame him.

Mr. GARLAND. I have got only a couple of minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. GARLAND. The wages paid on the street cars here are said to be about \$2.20 a day. That is not what we pay out in our country, and if that is the wage here it only goes to show that the people of Washington do not get what they ought to get, because the employees of the Government are the mark that is held up, and they say, "These Government clerks do not get any more, therefore you can not." In all our conferences in years gone by with employers the wages of Government employees were always used to beat down our wages.

Then, I want to say that the men on the street cars do not have to take an examination. In the Government service even the fellow who labors has got to go through an examination before he can get on. All of these men in Government service who work for these low wages have had to pass an examination of some form or other, and some of them are mighty hard ones. And I want to say that this present administration has a way of escaping even the payment of those wages that are now paid or should be paid. They have used this method before. When they find that they are a little short in their appropriations they simply lay off employees and require that they come to work every half day or every other day during the layoff and catch up with the work that they missed the day before. That was done two years ago, and I have introduced a bill to pay \$50,000 to remunerate the men who work in the Federal building, the scrub women, the janitors, and those who get the lowest wages. I have a bill in here to remunerate them for eight days which they lost. When at the end of the year it was found that the appropriation was a little short they laid off those poor fellows, made them come to work every half day or every other day, and compelled them to work harder and to do in one day the work that they should have done in two. I say that is an injustice of which the Government of the United States ought to be ashamed. [Applause.]

I hope this amendment will prevail.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, whatever action is taken on this bill relative to the increase of compensation of the Federal employees in the District of Columbia should be taken with respect to employees throughout the United States. It was the purpose of the Committee on Appropriations in making its report to attempt to establish a rule that could be applied uniformly to the employees of the Federal Government throughout the United States.

There are many differences of opinion as to what would be a proper ratio of increase. The great bulk of the commercial establishments which have given increased compensation to their employees have increased them 10 per cent. That seems to be the uniform rule adopted. There are employees of the Federal Government at salaries ranging from \$1,200 to \$1,800 whose compensation amounts to \$176,751,000, and employees at salaries of less than \$1,200 whose compensation aggregates \$155,187,381, making a total of \$337,311,866.

An increase of 10 per cent upon the compensation of those receiving salaries up to \$1,200, and 5 per cent on those receiving compensation of \$1,200 to \$1,800 will require an appropriation of \$23,720,673 for the fiscal year of 1918.

If the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] be adopted, the sum required will be \$51,441,346. So that the question that we are called upon to decide at this particular time is whether by this proposed amendment we will increase the amount to be paid in compensation to employees of the Government \$51,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, I am one of those who have worked to bring about, if it be possible to do so, some reasonable action by Congress to afford some additional compensation to Government employees who, as pointed out by the gentleman from Illinois, are employed at fixed salaries and do not share in the present great prosperity of the country. They are to some extent penalized because of excessive prices which prevail at present, and I believe it would be just and proper to do what is possible to help them.

There are many differences of opinion as to what should be done, but when it was considered, despite all assertions to the contrary, that the average Government employee is better off in the Government service than he would be outside of the service, that the average increase at this time because of existing conditions by private employers is 10 per cent, that we are facing a deficit of \$284,000,000, not including the possible additional expenditure of \$25,000,000 under the terms of the treaty for the acquisition of the Danish West Indies, which easily, as I pointed out the other day, makes possible a deficit running far in excess of \$300,000,000, notwithstanding all these matters it seems to the committee that the just, the fair, and the reasonable thing to do, and what can be justified in the face of all the facts, was to make the proposed increase of 10 and 5 per cent in the compensation as proposed originally in the bill.

I should like to increase as much as possible the compensation of all persons who are compelled to work to earn their living. But there are some things to be considered other than the mere fact that we would be glad to please some one. The responsibility that rests upon us is not only to do justice to the employees and the Government, but to see that no injustice is done to those who must pay to support the Government. It seems to me that we should not go farther than was originally suggested. Whatever is done on this bill, if we are to be just, should be incorporated in the District bill, in the sundry civil bill, in the fortifications bill, in the Navy bill, the Army bill, the Agricultural bill, and in the bill for the support of the Diplomatic and Consular Service. We must include all the persons embraced within that total expenditure of \$357,000,000. It would be unjust to do anything else. To attempt at this time, under all the circumstances, to add not \$25,000,000 but \$51,000,000 to the proposed expenditures in the next year would be unpardonable from any standpoint. I hope the amendment of the gentleman from Colorado will not be agreed to, and that the committee will adopt the recommendation that was incorporated in this bill by the Committee on Appropriations, and establish it as a uniform rule to control the House in all of its proceedings in their action on the other appropriation bills. If we do that much we shall do justice to the employees and all that anyone can reasonably expect, and we shall be able to justify our action to the taxpayers of the country.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I ask to have the amendment again reported to the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. KEATING: Page 142, after the word "or," in line 18, strike out "ten" and insert "twenty," and in line 20 strike out the word "five" and insert "ten."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KEATING) there were 25 ayes and 144 noes.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. NOLAN: On page 143, line 4, after the colon following the word "herein," insert the following:

"Provided, That during the fiscal year 1918 the minimum compensation for any person provided for in this bill shall be not less than \$3 per day, or, if employed by the hour, not less than 37½ cents an hour, and if employed by the month, \$90 a month; or, if employed by the year, \$1,080 per annum: *Provided further*, That persons employed on an annual basis and who regularly perform less than a full day's service shall receive compensation at the rate of 37½ cents per hour: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to persons enlisted in the military branches of the Government or to persons receiving subsistence and quarters in addition to their compensation: *And provided further*, That the provisions of this section shall apply only to those persons who have been continuously in the employment of the Government of the United States or in the employment of the government of the District of Columbia for a period of not less than two years and who shall have attained the age of 20 years.

Mr. SISSON. To that I make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment that I offer is strictly in order. The rule provides:

That no amendment shall be in order in the consideration of the foregoing amendment changing existing law beyond the fiscal year 1918, nor shall any amendment be in order relating to the compensation of employees not appropriated for in H. R. 18542.

The amendment that I propose limits the provisions of the minimum salary to the pending bill and to the employees appropriated for in the pending bill; and inasmuch as the rule provides that no amendment shall be in order in the consideration of the amendment changing existing law I contend that my amendment is strictly in order, and that the point of order should not be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. The special rule adopted only gave the committee the right to consider the Byrns amendment, which necessarily carried with it the right to offer germane amendments thereto. The rule did not authorize the adding of new affirmative legislation.

In the opinion of the Chair, the Byrns amendment simply proposed a lump appropriation to increase the compensation of employees of the Government provided for in this bill of a certain class, namely, those receiving less than \$1,800 per annum. The Nolan amendment proposes new affirmative legislation, namely, to adopt a policy by the Government that none of its employees appropriated for by this bill shall receive less than \$3 per day. The Chair can not see how the new affirmative legislation is germane to the intent or spirit of the Byrns amendment. Therefore the Chair is constrained to sustain the point of order.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the Chair amplify in the Record his reason for the ruling he has just announced?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; the Chair will amplify his reason in the Record. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois: Page 142, line 21, after the word "than," strike out "\$1,800" and insert "\$2,500."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Illinois on the point of order.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the rule, it seems to me, makes this amendment in order. Certainly this is in order, if the amendment of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] was in order, for an increase in salaries of Government employees. I can not see any ground whatever for the point of order. I have nothing further to say.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment is clearly subject to the point of order. The amendment offered and now pending provides for increases of salaries to clerks of a certain class and not exceeding \$1,800 per year. The gentleman from Illinois seeks to raise the limit and provide that it shall apply to clerks who draw as much as \$2,500 a year. Clearly by implication the rule reported by the Committee on Rules intended that no amendment should be in order for those particular clerks of the class set forth in the amendment reported by the Committee on Rules. It seems to me it would be a strained construction and would go beyond the real meaning and intentions of the rule to hold that an amendment would be in order seeking to raise the limit from \$1,800 to \$2,500. I do not think it is germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that this is an extremely close question, as members of the committee know, but, in the opinion of the Chair, this paragraph was to provide for an increase of compensation for the employees of a certain class, namely those within \$1,800 a year. The amendment proposed would create another class, and the Chair is of opinion that the amendment is not germane. The Chair, therefore, sustains the point of order.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the other day in the discussion of items relative to the Subtreasuries I made a statement to the effect that I had been informed that the Clearing House Association in Boston had been discontinued on account of the fact that there is a Federal reserve bank located in that city. I made that statement based on information which was given to the committee in some hearings that had been conducted on the day before and had every reason to believe it was correct. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] has handed me a telegram from his colleague [Mr. TAGUE] which I desire to read at this point, because I do not want to make any statement which is not entirely accurate. The telegram is as follows:

CHARLESTOWN, MASS., Dec. 19, 1916.

Hon. A. P. GARDNER,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

BYRNS in debate stated clearing house, Boston, discontinued. I have seen President Gaston, of Boston Clearing House, who denies this. Boston Clearing House still doing business, as they always have done. Boston reserve bank has become member of clearing house. I am in Boston for election day.

PETER F. TAGUE, Congressman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, pending the rising of the committee, I ask unanimous consent that I may have a few minutes in which to make a statement in connection with the statement just made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] respecting the Boston Subtreasury.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee has decided to rise, and the Chair thinks that such a request would be out of order.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the

bill H. R. 18542, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, pending that I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for half a minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to address the House for half a minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, all I wish to say is a word in respect to the telegram which the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] just read from the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TAGUE]. Mr. TAGUE requested me, on behalf of himself and on behalf of his colleagues, Mr. GALLIVAN and Mr. TINKHAM, to ask for a separate vote on the matter of the Boston Subtreasury. All of them are necessarily absent in Boston to-day on account of an election.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the two amendments relating to clerk hire of Members and Delegates. I think they are amendments numbered 1 and 2.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the two amendments relating to the Children's Bureau.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks for a separate vote on the two amendments about the increase of pay to clerks to Members, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks for a separate vote on two amendments relating to the Children's Bureau.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the amendment by which the office of the assistant treasurer at Boston was done away with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] asks for a separate vote on the Boston Subtreasury.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the amendment pertaining to the Subtreasury at Baltimore, and also a separate vote on the amendment pertaining to the Subtreasury at Chicago.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] asks for a separate vote on the Subtreasuries at Baltimore and Chicago.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the amendment in the bill that provides for a session stenographer.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I have already asked that.

Mr. BLACK. Excuse me.

The SPEAKER. That is included in the request of the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. RAINEY. I ask for a separate vote on the Borland amendment—Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request.

The SPEAKER. Are there any more? If not, the rest of the amendments will be voted on in gross.

The question was taken, and the remaining amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. WHEELER, page 19—

Mr. CALDWELL rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York rise?

Mr. CALDWELL. The first amendment was my amendment in reference to a session stenographer.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It does not come that way.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. CALDWELL: Page 19, line 18, after the word "for," insert "one"; before the word "hire," in line 19, insert "and one who shall be a stenographer"; in line 20, after the word "duties," insert "for one clerk"; and in line 22, after the word "necessary," insert "for the stenographer, \$75 per month during sessions of Congress, to pay which so much as may be necessary is hereby appropriated."

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York was a little late, but still the Chair will entertain his request demanding the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BENNET. Is this the amendment providing for an additional session stenographer?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 105, nays 245, answered "present" 3, not voting 80, as follows:

YEAS—105.

Abercrombie	Fairchild	Lazaro	Rouse
Austin	Farley	Lehlbach	Rowe
Bacharach	Ferris	Lenroot	Schall
Barchfeld	Fields	Littlepage	Sears
Bennet	Focht	McArthur	Shouse
Bowers	Freeman	McDermott	Siegel
Buchanan, Ill.	Gardner	McKellar	Sinnott
Buchanan, Tex.	Garland	McKinley	Smith, Idaho
Caldwell	Glynn	Maher	Smith, N. Y.
Cantrill	Gould	Martin	Snell
Carter, Mass.	Graham	Miller, Pa.	Snyder
Carter, Okla.	Gray, N. J.	Mondell	Sulloway
Chandler, N. Y.	Greene, Vt.	Moore, Pa.	Sutherland
Charles	Hamilton, N. Y.	Moore, Ind.	Swift
Church	Haskell	Mott	Taggart
Clark, Fla.	Hastings	Nicholls, S. C.	Tilson
Costello	Hayden	Oakey	Timberlake
Crago	Heaton	Olney	Walker
Curry	Hernandez	Parker, N. Y.	Ward
Dale, N. Y.	Hicks	Phelan	Wason
Dale, Vt.	Humphrey, Wash.	Platt	Whaley
Dallinger	Humphreys, Miss.	Powers	Wheeler
Dempsey	Husted	Ragsdale	Winslow
Dunn	Kearns	Raker	Woodyard
Dupré	Kless, Pa.	Ramseyer	
Estopinal	King	Roberts, Nev.	
Evans	Langley	Rodenberg	

NAYS—245.

Adair	Edwards	Kennedy, Iowa	Russell, Mo.
Adamson	Ellsworth	Kettner	Scott, Mich.
Alexander	Elston	Key, Ohio	Sells
Allen	Emerson	Kincheloe	Shallenberger
Almon	Esch	Kinkaid	Sherley
Anthony	Farr	Kitchin	Sherwood
Ashbrook	Fitzgerald	La Follette	Sims
Aswell	Fordney	Lee	Sisson
Ayres	Foss	Leshner	Slayden
Bailey	Foster	Lever	Sloan
Barkley	Frear	Lewis	Small
Barnhart	Fuller	Linthicum	Smith, Mich.
Bell	Gallagher	Lloyd	Smith, Minn.
Benedict	Gandy	London	Smith, Tex.
Black	Gard	Longworth	Sparkman
Blackmon	Garner	Loud	Stafford
Booher	Garrett	McAndrews	Steagall
Borland	Glass	McClintic	Stedman
Browne	Godwin, N. C.	McFadden	Steele, Iowa
Browning	Good	McKenzie	Steele, Pa.
Bruckner	Goodwin, Ark.	McLaughlin	Steenerson
Brumbaugh	Gordon	Madden	Stephens, Miss.
Burnett	Gray, Ala.	Magee	Stephens, Nebr.
Butler	Gray, Ind.	Mapes	Stephens, Tex.
Byrnes, S. C.	Green, Iowa	Matthews	Sterling
Byrns, Tenn.	Greene, Mass.	Mays	Stone
Callaway	Gregg	Miller, Del.	Stout
Campbell	Hadley	Montague	Summers
Candler, Miss.	Hamill	Morgan, La.	Sweet
Cannon	Hamilton, Mich.	Morgan, Okla.	Switzer
Carlin	Hamlin	Morrison	Talbott
Casey	Hardy	Moss	Tavener
Chapfield	Harrison, Miss.	Mudd	Taylor, Ark.
Coleman	Hawley	Murray	Taylor, Colo.
Collier	Heflin	Neely	Temple
Connelly	Helgesen	Nelson	Thomas
Conry	Helm	Nichols, Mich.	Thompson
Cooper, Ohio	Helvering	Nolan	Tillman
Cooper, W. Va.	Henry	North	Towner
Cooper, Wis.	Hilliard	Oliver	Treadway
Cox	Holland	O'Shaunessy	Vare
Cramton	Hollingsworth	Overmyer	Venable
Crisp	Hood	Padgett	Vinson
Crosser	Hopwood	Page, N. C.	Volstead
Danforth	Houston	Paige, Mass.	Walsh
Darrow	Howard	Park	Watkins
Davis, Tex.	Huddleston	Parker, N. J.	Watson, Pa.
Dent	Hughes	Porter	Watson, Va.
Dewalt	Hulbert	Pratt	Webb
Dickinson	Hull, Iowa	Price	Williams, T. S.
Dies	Hull, Tenn.	Quin	Williams, W. E.
Dill	Hutchinson	Rainey	Wilson, Ill.
Dillon	Igoe	Randall	Wilson, La.
Dixon	Jacoway	Rauch	Wingo
Dooling	James	Rayburn	Wise
Doolittle	Johnson, Ky.	Reavis	Wood, Ind.
Doughton	Johnson, S. Dak.	Reilly	Woods, Iowa
Dowell	Johnson, Wash.	Ricketts	Young, N. Dak.
Drukker	Kahn	Riordan	Young, Tex.
Eagan	Keating	Roberts, Mass.	
Eagle	Keister	Rogers	
Edmonds	Kelley	Rubey	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

Coady	Mann	Oldfield
Aiken	Capstick	Davis, Minn.
Anderson	Caraway	Decker
Beakes	Carew	Denison
Beales	Cary	Doremus
Britt	Cline	Driscoll
Britten	Copley	Dyer
Burgess	Cullop	Fess
Burke	Davenport	Finley

NOT VOTING—80.

Flood
Flynn
Gallivan
Gillett
Griest
Griffin
Guernsey
Harrison, Va.

Hart	Lafean	Moon	Sanford
Hayes	Lieb	Mooney	Saunders
Hayes	Liebel	Morin	Scott, Pa.
Hensley	Lindbergh	Norton	Scully
Hill	Lobeck	Oglesby	Shackelford
Hinds	Loft	Patten	Slemp
Howell	McCracken	Peters	Stiness
Jones	McCulloch	Pou	Tague
Kennedy, R. L.	McGillicuddy	Rowland	Tinkham
Kent	McLemore	Rucker	Van Dyke
Konop	Meeker	Russell, Ohio	Williams, Ohio
Kreider	Miller, Minn.	Sabath	Wilson, Fla.

So the amendment of Mr. CALDWELL was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania (in favor of all increases) with Mr. FESS (against).

Mr. TAGUE (in favor of increase) with Mr. HILL (against).

Mr. PATTEN (for) with Mr. OLDFIELD (against).

Mr. DYER (for) with Mr. DECKER (against).

Mr. COPLEY (for) with Mr. MOON (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. COADY with Mr. STINESS.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island with Mr. SAUNDERS.

Mr. AIKEN with Mr. MORIN.

Mr. VAN DYKE with Mr. NORTON.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD with Mr. PETERS.

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. ROWLAND.

Mr. SABATH with Mr. RUSSELL of Ohio.

Mr. RUCKER with Mr. SANFORD.

Mr. OGLESBY with Mr. SLEMP.

Mr. McLEMORE with Mr. TINKHAM.

Mr. MCGILLICUDDY with Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio.

Mr. LOFT with Mr. ANDERSON.

Mr. LOBECK with Mr. BRITT.

Mr. LIEBEL with Mr. BRITTEN.

Mr. LIEB with Mr. CAPSTICK.

Mr. JONES with Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota.

Mr. HENSLEY with Mr. DENISON.

Mr. HART with Mr. GUERNSEY.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia with Mr. KREIDER.

Mr. GRIFFIN with Mr. HAYES.

Mr. FLYNN with Mr. HOWELL.

Mr. FLOOD with Mr. KREIDER.

Mr. BEAKES with Mr. BEALES.

Mr. FINLEY with Mr. LAFEAN.

Mr. DRISCOLL with Mr. MCCracken.

Mr. DOREMUS with Mr. MCCULLOCH.

Mr. CAREW with Mr. MEEKER.

Mr. CARAWAY with Mr. MILLER of Minnesota.

Mr. BURKE with Mr. MOONEY.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman from California in the Hall listening?

Mr. HAYES. No, sir; I was not.

The SPEAKER. Then the gentleman does not bring himself within the rule.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. WHEELER:

Page 19, line 20, strike out the figures "\$1,500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,000."

Strike out the figures "\$660,000" in line 21, page 19, and insert in lieu thereof "\$880,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. WHEELER and Mr. ADAIR demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 185, nays 168, answered "present" 7, not voting 73, as follows:

YEAS—185.

Anthony	Cantrill	Darrow	Farley
Austin	Carter, Mass.	Davis, Minn.	Farr
Bacharach	Casey	Dempsey	Ferris
Barchfeld	Chandler, N. Y.	Denison	Focht
Benedict	Charles	Dillon	Fordney
Bennet	Church	Dooling	Freeman
Blackmon	Clark, Fla.	Doolittle	Gallagher
Bowers	Cooper, W. Va.	Dunn	Gandy
Browning	Costello	Dupré	Gardner
Bruckner	Crago	Ellsworth	Garland
Brumbaugh	Crisp	Elston	Glynn
Buchanan, Ill.	Curry	Gould	Graham
Buchanan, Tex.	Dale, N. Y.	Gray, Ala.	Gray, N. J.
Burnett	Dale, Vt.	Estopinal	
Caldwell	Dallinger	Evans	
Cannon	Danforth	Fairchild	

Greene, Vt.	Kless, Pa.	Mudd	Sloan
Hadley	King	Neely	Smith, Idaho
Hamilton, Mich.	Kinkaid	Nicholls, S. C.	Smith, Minn.
Hamilton, N. Y.	Langley	Nolan	Smith, N. Y.
Hamlin	Lazaro	North	Snell
Hardy	Lee	Onkey	Snyder
Haskell	Lehlbach	Olney	Steenserson
Hastings	Lenroot	O'Shaunessy	Stephens, Nebr.
Hawley	Leshner	Overymyer	Stone
Hayden	Lewis	Parker, N. Y.	Stout
Hayes	Linthicum	Phelan	Sulloway
Heaton	Littlepage	Platt	Sutherland
Helgesen	London	Porter	Swift
Henry	Loud	Powers	Talbott
Hernandez	McArthur	Pratt	Timberlake
Hicks	McDermott	Price	Van Dyke
Hopwood	McGillicuddy	Ragsdale	Volstead
Howard	McKellar	Raker	Walker
Hughes	McKinley	Randall	Walsh
Hull, Iowa	McLaughlin	Reavis	Ward
Humphrey, Wash.	Magee	Riordan	Wason
Husted	Maher	Roberts, Mass.	Watson, Pa.
Hutchinson	Martin	Roberts, Nev.	Whaley
Igoe	Matthews	Rodenberg	Wheeler
Johnson, S. Dak.	Meeker	Rogers	Williams, T. S.
Johnson, Wash.	Miller, Del.	Rowe	Winslow
Kahn	Miller, Pa.	Schall	Woods, Iowa
Kearns	Mondell	Sherwood	Young, N. Dak.
Keister	Moore, Pa.	Shouse	
Kent	Moore, Ind.	Siegel	
Key, Ohio	Mott	Sinnott	

NAYS—168.

Abercrombie	Dowell	Kincheloe	Sherley
Adair	Eagan	Kitchin	Sims
Adamson	Eagle	La Follette	Sisson
Alexander	Edmonds	Lever	Slayden
Allen	Emerson	Lloyd	Small
Almon	Esch	Longworth	Smith, Mich.
Ashbrook	Fields	McAndrews	Smith, Tex.
Aswell	Fitzgerald	McClintic	Stafford
Ayres	Flood	McFadden	Steagall
Bailey	Foss	McKenzie	Stedman
Barkley	Foster	McLemore	Steele, Iowa
Barnhart	Frear	Madden	Steele, Pa.
Bell	Fuller	Mapes	Stephens, Miss.
Black	Garner	Mays	Stephens, Tex.
Booher	Garrett	Montague	Sterling
Borland	Glass	Morgan, La.	Summers
Browne	Godwin, N. C.	Morgan, Okla.	Sweet
Butler	Good	Morrison	Switzer
Byrnes, S. C.	Goodwin, Ark.	Moss	Taylor, Ark.
Byrns, Tenn.	Goodwin	Murray	Taylor, Colo.
Callaway	Gray, Ind.	Nelson	Temple
Campbell	Green, Iowa	Nichols, Mich.	Thomas
Candler, Miss.	Greene, Mass.	Oliver	Thompson
Caraway	Gregg	Padgett	Tillman
Carlin	Hamill	Page, N. C.	Tilson
Chapfield	Haugen	Paige, Mass.	Towner
Coleman	Heflin	Park	Treadway
Collier	Helm	Parker, N. J.	Vare
Connelly	Helvering	Quin	Venable
Conry	Hilliard	Rainey	Vinson
Cooper, Ohio	Holland	Ramseyer	Watkins
Cooper, Wis.	Hollingsworth	Rauch	Watson, Va.
Cox	Hood	Rayburn	Webb
Cramton	Houston	Redly	Williams, W. E.
Crosser	Huddleston	Ricketts	Williams, Ohio
Davis, Tex.	Humphreys, Miss.	Rouse	Wilson, Ill.
Dent	Jacoway	Rubey	Wilson, La.
Dewalt	James	Russell, Mo.	Wingo
Dickinson	Johnson, Ky.	Scott, Mich.	Wise
Dies	Keating	Sears	Wood, Ind.
Dixon	Kelley	Sells	Woodyard
Doughton	Kennedy, Iowa	Shallenberger	Young, Tex.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—7.

Coady	Hulbert	Mann	Saunders
Harrison, Miss.	Hull, Tenn.	Oldfield	

NOT VOTING—73.

Aiken	Dyer	Konop	Rowland
Anderson	Edwards	Kreider	Rucker
Beakes	Fess	Lafcan	Russell, Ohio
Beales	Finley	Lieb	Sabath
Britt	Flynn	Liebel	Sanford
Britten	Gallivan	Lindbergh	Scott, Pa.
Burgess	Gillett	Lobeck	Scully
Burke	Griest	Loft	Shackleford
Capstick	Griffin	McCracken	Siemp
Carew	Guernsey	McCulloch	Sparkman
Carter, Okla.	Harrison, Va.	Miller, Minn.	Stiness
Cary	Hart	Moon	Taggart
Cline	Hensley	Mooney	Tague
Copley	Hill	Morin	Tavener
Cullop	Hinds	Norton	Tinkham
Davenport	Howell	Oglesby	Wilson, Fla.
Decker	Jones	Patten	
Doremus	Kennedy, R. I.	Peters	
Driscoll	Kettner	Pou	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. CAREW with Mr. ANDERSON.

Mr. COADY with Mr. STINESS.

Mr. HILL (for) with Mr. HULL of Tennessee (against).

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island (for) with Mr. SAUNDERS (against).

Mr. GALLIVAN (for) with Mr. HARRISON (against).

Mr. DYER (for) with Mr. DECKER (against).

Mr. TAGUE (for) with Mr. HULBERT (against).
 Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania (for) with Mr. GILLET (against).
 Mr. PATTEN (for) with Mr. OLDFIELD (against).
 Mr. CROLEY (for) with Mr. MOON (against).
 Mr. FESS (for) with Mr. HENSLEY (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. JONES with Mr. TINKHAM.

Mr. KETTNER with Mr. NORTON.

Mr. TAGGART with Mr. PETERS.

Mr. GRIFFIN with Mr. HINDS.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma with Mr. GUERNSEY.

Mr. DAVENPORT with Mr. CAPSTICK.

Mr. TAVENNER with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Speaker, I voted "no." I am paired with the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. TAGUE. I desire to withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. HULBERT, and he answered "Present."

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I voted "no." I find I am paired with the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. HILL. I desire to withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. HULL of Tennessee, and he answered "Present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment striking out the Boston Subtreasury—

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, the first amendment to be considered of these Subtreasuries is that at Baltimore.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Baltimore amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 58, line 21, after the word "treasurer," insert the following:

"Strike out the balance of the paragraph after the word 'Treasurer,' and insert the following: 'Assistant treasurer, \$4,500; cashier, \$2,500; paying teller, \$2,000; receiving teller, \$1,900; exchange teller, \$1,800; vault clerk, \$1,800; clerks—two at \$1,600 each, three at \$1,400 each, three at \$1,200 each, three at \$1,000 each; messenger, \$840; three watchmen at \$720 each; in all, \$31,500.'"

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. STAFFORD. A division, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin demands a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 232, noes 33.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next one, the Boston amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 59, by striking out the paragraph beginning with line 1 and ending with line 9.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. We do not know what that means.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will listen to it when it is read. The Clerk will report it again.

The Clerk read as follows:

Boston, office of assistant treasurer: Assistant treasurer, \$5,000; cashier, \$2,500; paying teller, \$2,500; vault clerk, \$2,000; receiving teller, \$2,000; redemption teller, \$1,800; clerks—1, \$2,200; 5 at \$1,600 each; 1, \$1,500; 1, \$1,400; 2 at \$1,200 each; 3 at \$1,100 each; 4 at \$1,000 each; chief guard, \$1,100; 3 watchmen, at \$850 each; laborer and guard, \$720; 4 money counters and handlers for money laundry machines, at \$900 each; in all, \$46,570.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next one.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 59, by striking out the paragraph beginning with line 10 and ending with line 20, which reads as follows: "Chicago, office of assistant treasurer: Assistant treasurer, \$5,000; cashier, \$3,000; assistant cashier, \$2,000; vault clerk, \$2,250; paying teller, \$2,500; assisting teller, \$2,000; redemption teller, \$2,000; change teller, \$2,000; receiving teller, \$2,000; 2 bookkeepers, at \$1,500 each; clerks—1, \$1,750; 1, \$1,600; 3 at \$1,500 each; 13 at \$1,200 each; attendant for money laundry machines, \$1,200; hall man, \$1,100; messenger, \$840; 3 watchmen, at \$720 each; janitor, \$720; 8 money counters and handlers for money laundry machines, at \$900 each; in all, \$71,420."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Children's Bureau amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of line 22, page 134, insert a new paragraph, as follows: "To investigate and report upon matters pertaining to the welfare of children and child life, and especially investigate the questions of infant mortality, \$72,120."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, there are two amendments relating to the Children's Bureau. I ask unanimous consent that they may be voted upon together.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the vote may be taken upon the two amendments together as to the Children's Bureau. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the other amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Second amendment, line 16, page 135: Strike out the figures "\$58,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$95,000."

Mr. MANN. Upon the amendments I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks for the yeas and nays on these amendments. Those who favor taking the vote by yeas and nays will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Evidently a sufficient number, and the Clerk will call the roll. Those in favor of the amendments will answer "yea" when their names are called; those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 316, nays 28, answered "present" 2, not voting 87, as follows:

YEAS—316.

Abercrombie	Drukker	Johnson, Wash.	Platt
Adair	Dunn	Kahn	Powers
Alexander	Dupré	Kearns	Pratt
Allen	Eagan	Keating	Quin
Anthony	Eagle	Kelster	Ragsdale
Ashbrook	Ellsworth	Kelley	Raker
Aswell	Elston	Kennedy, Iowa	Ramseyer
Austin	Emerson	Kent	Randall
Ayres	Esch	Kettner	Rauch
Bacharach	Estopinal	Key, Ohio.	Rayburn
Balley	Evans	Kless, Pa.	Reavis
Bachfield	Fairchild	Kincheloe	Reilly
Barkley	Farr	Kinkaid	Ricketts
Barnhart	Ferris	Kitchin	Riordan
Bell	Fields	Kitchin	Roberts, Mass.
Benedict	Focht	La Follette	Roberts, Nev.
Bennet	Foss	Langley	Rodenberg
Black	Foster	Lehlbach	Rogers
Bowers	Frear	Lenroot	Rouse
Browne	Freeman	Leshner	Rowe
Browning	Fuller	Lever	Rubey
Bruckner	Gallagher	Linthicum	Russell, Mo.
Brunbaugh	Gandy	Littlepage	Schall
Buchanan, Ill.	Gard	Lloyd	Scott, Mich.
Burnett	Gardner	London	Sears
Butler	Garland	Longworth	Sells
Byrnes, S. C.	Glass	Loud	Shallenberger
Caldwell	Good	McAndrews	Sherley
Campbell	Goodwin, Ark.	McArthur	Sherwood
Cannon	Gould	McClintic	Shouse
Cantrill	Gray, Ala.	McDermott	Siegel
Caraway	Gray, Ind.	McFadden	Sims
Carlin	Gray, N. J.	McGillcuddy	Sinnott
Carter, Mass.	Green, Iowa	McKellar	Sloan
Carter, Okla.	Greene, Mass.	McKenzie	Smith, Idaho
Casby	Greene, Vt.	McKinley	Smith, Mich.
Chandler, N. Y.	Gregg	McLaughlin	Smith, N. Y.
Charles	Hadley	McLemore	Smith, Tex.
Chipfield	Hamil	Madden	Snell
Church	Hamilton, Mich.	Magee	Snyder
Clark, Fla.	Hamilton, N. Y.	Maher	Steagall
Coady	Hamil	Mann	Stedman
Coleman	Harrison, Miss.	Mapes	Steele, Pa.
Collier	Harrison, Va.	Martin	Steenerson
Connelly	Haskell	Matthews	Stephens, Miss.
Conry	Hastings	Mays	Stephens, Tex.
Cooper, Ohio	Hawley	Meeker	Sterling
Cooper, W. Va.	Hayden	Miller, Del.	Stout
Cooper, Wis.	Hayes	Miller, Pa.	Sullivan
Costello	Heaton	Mondell	Summers
Cox	Hefflin	Moore, Pa.	Sutherland
Crago	Helgesen	Moore, Ind.	Sweet
Cramton	Helvering	Morgan, La.	Swift
Crisp	Henry	Morgan, Okla.	Switzer
Crosser	Hernandez	Moss	Talbott
Curry	Hicks	Mott	Tavener
Dale, N. Y.	Hilliard	Mudd	Taylor, Ark.
Dale, Vt.	Holland	Murray	Taylor, Colo.
Dallinger	Hollingsworth	Neely	Temple
Danforth	Hood	Nelson	Thompson
Darrow	Hopwood	Nichols, Mich.	Tillman
Davis, Minn.	Howard	Nolan	Tilson
Davis, Tex.	Huddleston	North	Timberlake
Dempsey	Hughes	Oakey	Towner
Denison	Hulbert	Oldfield	Treadway
Dewalt	Hull, Iowa	Oliver	Van Dyke
Dickinson	Humphrey, Wash.	Olney	Vare
Dies	Humphreys, Miss.	O'Shaunessy	Venable
Dill	Husted	Overmyer	Vinson
Dillon	Hutchinson	Padgett	Volstead
Dixon	Igoe	Paige, Mass.	Walsh
Dooling	Jacoway	Park	Ward
Doolittle	James	Parker, N. J.	Wason
Doughton	Johnson, Ky.	Parker, N. Y.	
Dowell	Johnson, S. Dak.	Phelan	

Watson, Pa.
Whaley
Wheeler
Williams, T. S.

Williams, W. E.
Williams, Ohio
Wilson, Ill.
Wilson, La.

Wingo
Winslow
Wise
Wood, Ind.

Woods, Iowa
Woodyard
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Tex.

NAYS—28.

Almon
Booher
Borland
Buchanan, Tex.
Byrns, Tenn.
Callaway
Candler, Miss.

Dent
Fitzgerald
Garner
Garrett
Godwin, N. C.
Gordon
Hardy

Helm
Houston
Hull, Tenn.
Montague
Morrison
Nicholls, S. C.
Page, N. C.

Rainey
Slayden
Stafford
Steele, Iowa
Thomas
Watkins
Watson, Va.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Blackmon
Haugen

NOT VOTING—87.

Adamson
Aiken
Anderson
Beakes
Beales
Britt
Britten
Burgess
Burke
Capstick
Carew
Cary
Cline
Copley
Cullop
Davenport
Decker
Doremus
Driscoll
Dyer
Edmonds
Edwards

Farley
Fess
Finley
Flood
Flynn
Fordney
Gallivan
Gillett
Glynn
Graham
Griest
Griffin
Guernsey
Hart
Hensley
Hill
Hinds
Howell
Jones
Kennedy, R. I.
Konop
Kreider

Lafean
Lazaro
Lee
Lewis
Lieb
Liebel
Lindbergh
Lobeck
Loft
McCracken
McCulloch
Miller, Minn.
Moon
Mooney
Morin
Norton
Oglesby
Patten
Peters
Porter
Pou
Price

Rowland
Rucker
Russell, Ohio
Sabath
Sanford
Saunders
Scott, Pa.
Scully
Shackelford
Sisson
Slomp
Small
Smith, Minn.
Sparkman
Stiness
Taggart
Tague
Tinkham
Walker
Webb
Wilson, Fla.

So the amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BLACKMON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my vote of yea and announce my pair with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER].

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote yea.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall and listening when his name was called?

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. I was in the doorway or very close to it. I was just between—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not bring himself within the rule.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. DECKER with Mr. FESS.

Mr. ADAMSON with Mr. EDMONDS.

Mr. BLACKMON with Mr. DYER.

Mr. FLOOD with Mr. GLYNN.

Mr. FARLEY with Mr. FORDNEY.

Mr. LEE with Mr. GRAHAM.

Mr. POU with Mr. SMITH of Michigan.

Mr. GALLIVAN with Mr. PORTER.

Mr. MOON with Mr. HILL.

Mr. SISSON with Mr. STINESS.

Mr. WEBB with Mr. COPLEY.

Mr. WALKER with Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania.

Mr. TAGUE with Mr. GILLET.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how the Clerk has me recorded on roll call No. 7, on the Wheeler amendment?

The SPEAKER. As soon as this bill is disposed of the Chair will recognize the gentleman. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer a motion to recommit the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GOOD. I am not.

The SPEAKER. Does any gentleman who is opposed to the bill want to make a motion to recommit?

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a motion to recommit, but I am not opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER. That puts the gentleman in the same class as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] who has the prior right to recognition. If no one opposed to the bill is going to make the motion, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD], whose motion the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GOOD moves to recommit H. R. 18542 to the Committee on Appropriations, with instructions to that committee to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: Strike out lines 14 to 22, inclusive, on page 51.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the matter proposed to be stricken out.

The Clerk read the matter proposed to be stricken out, as follows:

For investigation and experimentation and to secure better methods of administration, with a view to increased efficiency or to greater economy in the expenditure of public money, including necessary traveling expenses, in connection with special work, or obtaining of better administrative methods in any branch of the service within or under the Treasury Department, including the temporary employment of agents, stenographers, accountants, or other expert services either within or without the District of Columbia, \$15,000.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken, and the motion to recommit was rejected.

The bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ASPHALT LANDS OF THE CHOCTAW AND CHICKASAW TRIBES IN OKLAHOMA.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider House joint resolution 306.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of House joint resolution 306, of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

House joint resolution 306.

Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to extend the time for payment of the deferred installments due on the purchase of tracts of the surface of the segregated coal and asphalt lands of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Tribes in Oklahoma.

Mr. MANN. I ask to have the resolution reported.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to extend the time for payment of the final installment due on the purchase of tracts of the surface of the segregated coal and asphalt land area belonging to the Choctaw and Chickasaw Tribes, sold under the act of Congress approved February 19, 1912 (37 Stat. L., p. 67), to four years after the sale was made instead of two years, as provided in section 5 of the said act: Provided, That the accrued interest on all installments to date when due and the principal of the second installment, if due, shall be paid before an extension as herein provided may be granted: And provided further, That in all other respects the provisions of existing law shall apply to these purchases.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman if this has the favorable indorsement of the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. It has, and the bill was drawn by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

Hour of Meeting to-morrow.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow morning. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to give notice that the urgent deficiency bill will be called up the first thing to-morrow morning.

Adjournment for the holidays.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following privileged resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House concurrent resolution No. 67.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Friday, December 22, 1918, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Tuesday, January 2, 1919.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KITCHIN) there were—ayes 141, noes 44.

Mr. RAKER. I make the point of no quorum.

Mr. RUBEY. I call for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California makes the point of no quorum, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY] demands the yeas and nays. The Chair will count.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of no quorum.

Mr. RUBEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER (after counting). Thirty-one gentlemen have risen, not a sufficient number.

Mr. COX. I ask for the other side.

The SPEAKER (after counting). One hundred and sixty gentlemen have arisen, and the yeas and nays are refused.

So the resolution was agreed to.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record some data and facts which I have secured pertaining to the Agricultural Department and its service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Reserving the right to object, on what line?

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. Relating to the employees and the service.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does the gentleman criticize it?

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. No.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Boosts it? [Laughter.]

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. Yes; I boost it a little.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 19119, the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. GARRETT in the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 19119) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I will ask the gentleman how long he expects the House to remain in session to-night?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I will say to the gentleman that I had no time set. I did not want to see several hours go to waste, however. I have had practically no applications for time in general debate, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. Then I think perhaps we had better read the bill.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Oh, I trust the gentleman will not take up the time of the House in a first reading of the bill.

Mr. MANN. No one was anticipating that this bill would come up for consideration to-day. We met at 11 o'clock this morning with the avowed purpose of trying to get through the legislative bill and then quitting. I am not willing, if I can prevent it, to have the House taken unawares with the consideration of this bill, especially as we have already agreed to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow. I can see no difficulty, as far as we can look ahead, in finishing this bill by Friday.

Mr. MADDEN. I think we ought to have three or four hours of general debate on the bill.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. No one on this side wants any general debate on the bill, nor have any applications been made to the ranking Member on the Republican side, as I understand it.

Mr. MANN. I would suggest that we might dispense with the first reading of the bill and then rise. We have had a somewhat arduous day.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Let us read the first paragraph of the bill this afternoon.

Mr. MANN. As far as I am concerned, I have no objection to that.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I would be willing to do that, if the gentleman will permit me to make a statement of five minutes.

Mr. MANN. I do not care how long the statement is. I could listen to the gentleman for an hour.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Then I shall make the motion to rise, after reading the first paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration appropriates for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918. In making a brief statement as to the bill and the appropriations which it carries, I want to say to the committee that the legislative provision which, in one form or another, has been in this bill during the last three or four sessions of Congress, relative to the fiscal relations existing between the Government and the District of Columbia, is not contained in this bill. I desire to say, further, that this was left out, not because those who favor a different system than that now in force, having charge of the formulation of the appropriation bill, have in the slightest degree changed their minds as to what ought to be done in that particular; but it has been left out more for the reason that it seems futile to undertake to legislate this provision in an appropriation bill. Realizing that time is of some value at this particular session of Congress, we have omitted any legislation upon that subject.

The estimates submitted through the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for appropriations for the fiscal year for which the bill appropriates, exclusive of the water revenues, were \$16,278,092.66. The bill as reported to the House carries \$12,831,099.66, an amount \$255,222.56 in excess of the current law for the District. However, it is \$3,446,993 less than the estimates submitted by the commissioners.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. What were the improvements contemplated for which the commissioners asked for \$3,446,993 more than the committee recommended?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I will say to the gentleman that there were a number of items that went to make up this sum. Some of the principal ones were estimates for the acquisition of a tract of land in the northwest for park purposes, carrying \$825,000; for the purchase of another tract of land for park purposes in the northeast, for which \$500,000 was asked. About the same amount was contained in the estimates for the construction of a municipal hospital. The other items were made up of smaller amounts, one of the others of those not mentioned being the purchase of land and the beginning of an appropriation for the beginning of a sewage-disposal plant, and the others were matters carrying not a large amount in themselves.

Mr. MADDEN. The committee concluded it was not wise to enter upon the construction, operation, and maintenance of a municipal hospital at this time?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. The subcommittee formulating this bill decided that it was practically useless to bring a measure of that kind into the House of Representatives, having had some experience in dealing with that particular question. It was on all fours with the proposition I mentioned in the beginning of my remarks. It is one of those things which would merely consume time, amount to nothing, having been up on various occasions before, only to fail.

Mr. MADDEN. Did the committee conclude it was not time yet to consider the establishment of a sewage-disposal plant because there is no need for it in the District?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Yes, sir; partly that and partly from the fact that it would involve legislative provisions that would probably not be considered by the House, at least it would be subject to the point of order, and we knew of opposition to the matter that would keep us from considering it.

Mr. MADDEN. From the investigation the committee has made on the question of the necessity of a sewage-disposal plant has it reached the conclusion that there will be no such necessity in the immediate future?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Well, I can not say for the committee; but I can speak for myself that my own information is from an investigation and the evidence that has been taken before the committee that there will be no necessity in the immediate or near future.

Mr. MADDEN. Where does the sewage of the District go—out into the Potomac River?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. At the present time in the Potomac River.

Mr. MADDEN. Does not the gentleman and his committee think the time is coming when there ought to be some other disposition made of the sewage in order to preserve the health

of the people who live below the city of Washington on the Potomac River?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Well, I will say to the gentleman in this connection that this bill does carry appropriation for the extension of certain sewer mains that will carry, when completed, that part of the sewage of the city that now enters into the Potomac near the city of Washington farther down the river.

Mr. MADDEN. Still the people living farther down are subject to contamination from the sewage that goes into the river from the city of Washington?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. That is true to the extent that there are people living farther down the river which, on personal investigation I think the gentleman from Illinois will find, are not very many. I do not think there is any immediate danger to the inhabitants living on the river from the disposal of the sewage. There is a necessity, unquestionably, for the getting of this sewage into the river at a point lower down the river.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman has made an investigation and knows the necessities of the case, and I merely asked this question to call the attention of the committee to the fact that there is no more important question than the disposition of the sewage in such a way that it will not contaminate the health of the people.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I agree with the gentleman thoroughly, but I do not think the time has come when there is any amount of danger to the city of Washington or to the people on the river below.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in the bill under consideration your committee has been in its own judgment, whatever may be the judgment of the House, rather liberal in the number of increases of employment in the service of the District of Columbia, as well as in certain increases of compensation to employees of the District, who would not come within the scope of the provision that was adopted to-day in connection with the Federal employees provided for in the legislative bill.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I will yield, with pleasure.

Mr. MANN. The House this afternoon having voted to increase the compensation of certain Federal employees carried in the legislative bill, does the gentleman expect the House to make the same increase to employees of the District of Columbia employed here in the same place?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I think there is a necessity for it, and justice demands that the same provision should be placed in this bill before it is completed. And I will say to the gentleman that up to yesterday that had been the anticipation of the men having this bill in charge, to carry in the bill exactly the same provision that was in the legislative bill; but it is not in the bill at the present time for reasons I need not explain.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. If the gentleman from Illinois will pardon me, I will.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman plan to extend the horizontal per cent bonus to the employees carried in the District of Columbia appropriation bill?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. The provision as drawn in the subcommittee, to be frank, and submitted to the full committee in connection with this bill, was to increase the pay of those employees in the District of Columbia receiving a salary of less than \$1,200 10 per cent, and of those receiving salaries of from \$1,200 to \$1,800 5 per cent.

Those excluded from this were the members of the Metropolitan police force, those who belonged to the fire organizations of the city, and those connected with the public schools. The provision as drawn by the subcommittee included also the same ratio of increase to the per diem employees of the District of Columbia. Those below the sum receiving an increase of 10 per cent, those above receiving an increase of 5 per cent. It also included a provision by which those employed by the District in institutions receiving their subsistence and now being paid less than \$1,000 a year should have an increase of 5 per cent in their salaries. That was the provision as drawn, and which I think measures out equity to the employees of the District of Columbia.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. The House to-day having indicated by a substantial majority its desire to increase the pay of all the employees provided for in the legislative bill receiving a salary of \$1,800 or less, does the gentleman now think he ought to differentiate in the District between different classes of employment? I suppose they are just as hungry in one class as they are in another.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I will say to the gentleman that I think that in this particular case there is a reason for the exclusion of those classes I enumerated, and I think he will agree with me when I call his attention to it. In this bill last year, the current law, we increased the compensation of the police force. In the present bill we have undertaken to increase the compensation of the firemen of the District.

Mr. MANN. You have no right to do so. That will probably go out on a point of order.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Certainly it may, if we can not make our case. We have no right under the rule, the gentleman now suggests, but we did it because we thought there was sufficient equity in it, and so far as the police force is concerned that is past. Nobody can make a point of order, I think, against that.

Mr. MANN. But that occurred before the present emergency arose. To be perfectly frank with the gentleman, it was the agreement with other Members of the House to defeat any increase reported in the legislative bill, with the understanding on my part—possibly I was foolish not to secure sufficient knowledge concerning it—that if that prevailed and the House would not increase the amount, the increase would be carried to all the employees of the Government receiving those salaries.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I can say to the gentleman that to the Metropolitan police I am entirely friendly, and I will be glad to include them in any just scheme. But I imagine that the pinch of the high cost of living is no worse in Washington than in the gentleman's city, and we increase their salaries to a plane that will compare with even those of the size of the city from which the gentleman comes.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; not at all. But that is neither here nor there. However, it is nothing like it.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I think the grades are not organized on the same basis, but still they compare most favorably with salaries paid the police forces of cities corresponding in size with the city of Washington. The same is true of the fire department, and so far as the school organization is concerned—and the gentleman knows and every other gentleman knows that under the plan of organization and under the law that controls the automatic promotion of the teachers of the school system of the city of Washington that they are more highly paid on the average than they are in any other city, not only of the size, but of any other size, in this country. And we thought there ought to be some equity in this matter, and, therefore, it was in the mind of the committee to exclude those. But, I remind the gentleman, this has passed entirely out of the hands of the Appropriations Committee. It is in the hands of the House. There is no provision now in this bill. It can not get into this bill if there is anybody in the House who wants to make a point of order against it, unless there is a rule provided. It is up to the Committee on Rules, it seems to me, as to the automatic increase of the salaries in this bill.

Mr. BENNET. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. BENNET. As a member of the Committee on Rules, are we to construe that as a request for a rule?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I have not requested it. I can not answer the gentleman whether any other gentleman has requested it or not.

Mr. MANN. The experience of the Committee on Appropriations is not such that they are running to the Committee on Rules on every question?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Not every morning; no, sir.

Mr. BENNET. You are always very willing for the Committee on Rules to give rules to the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Well, the House seems to be, whatever may be the attitude of the Committee on Appropriations.

I was going to say when I was interrupted that there are about 100 new employments provided for in this bill. However, there are 110 less than were asked for in the estimates submitted to us. We have here and there increased the compensation of certain employees of the District of Columbia for reasons that seemed to the committee to be good and sufficient. Of course, in many instances, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] suggested awhile ago, we recognize the fact that they were subject to a point of order, and any gentleman, if alert enough, can forbid us carrying into effect the purpose we had in raising this compensation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, with that statement I have concluded. Under the five-minute rule there will be much discussion of various items. I ask that the Clerk may read the first paragraph of the bill.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Yes.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman yield me three or four minutes?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Yes; but I want to keep faith. Yes; I will yield to the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, I am one of those who believe that the organic act of the District of Columbia, known as the "half-and-half act," has outlived its usefulness and that it can be repealed without doing any injustice to the people of the District of Columbia, but that equity and justice to the people of the United States demands that it be repealed.

I know this is the short session of Congress, and I have conferred with some friends who believe as I do, and they think that it is inexpedient to attempt a fight again at this short session to repeal the half-and-half act on this appropriation bill. It is the practice that when legislation is placed upon an appropriation bill, if the other House refuses to agree to it, the House proposing the legislation recedes. This House last session passed on the District appropriation bill a provision repealing the half-and-half act, but the Senate refused to concur; and I apprehend if we should get the repeal again incorporated in this bill the other branch, constituted now just as it was during the last session of this Congress, would again refuse to concur, and the House would have to recede.

That being true, I do not intend to call the matter up at this session, but I have in nowise changed my opinion about the merits of the proposition, and I am confident that when the people of the United States understand the proposition the law will be repealed. And if I am living when the next Congress convenes, composed of a number of new Representatives from the people, a number of new Members in both branches, I will again call the attention of Congress to it and try to have the law repealed.

I simply make this statement for the reason that I do not care for the press of this city and others to assume that I have abandoned the fight, for I will not abandon it until in my judgment equity is done the people of the United States. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That one half of the following sums, respectively, is appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and the other half out of the revenues of the District of Columbia, in full for the following expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, namely:

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. GARRETT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 19119) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report that it had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing an article appearing in the Chicago Herald, of Sunday, December 8, and written by Mr. James Keeley, the editor, on the United States business after the war.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing the article indicated by him. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolution of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. J. Res. 324. Joint resolution authorizing payment of the salaries of officers and employees of Congress for December, 1918.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 7095. An act extending the time for completion of the bridge across the Delaware River, authorized by an act entitled "An act to authorize the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. and the Pennsylvania & Newark Railroad Co., or their successors, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Delaware River," approved the 24th day of August, 1912.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned, pursuant to the order previously made, until to-morrow, Wednesday, December 20, 1916, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on reexamination of New River, N. C., and inland waterways between Beaufort Harbor and New River, and New River and Swansboro (H. Doc. No. 1775); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.
2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a tentative draft of a bill to authorize the acquirement of a site and the erection and equipment of a building for use of the post office and other governmental offices at Oakland, Cal. (H. Doc. No. 1776); to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and ordered to be printed.
3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting report of the Secretary of the Treasury relative to the United States Subtreasuries and their relation to the Federal reserve bank (H. Doc. No. 1777); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.
4. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Lewis H. Gest v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 1778); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.
5. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia submitting an urgent estimate of appropriation for rent of temporary quarters for the office of the recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia, pending the reconstruction of the courthouse (H. Doc. No. 1779); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13799) granting an increase of pension to D. O. Root; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 8268) granting a pension to Josephine W. James; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 19178) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 19179) to exclude from the United States mails all printed matter advertising for sale or soliciting the sale of intoxicating liquors addressed to points within certain States and Territories, and providing penalties for violations; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 19180) to provide for a survey and estimate of cost of removing bends in Black River at Lorain, Ohio; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. STAFFORD: A bill (H. R. 19181) to authorize the coinage of one-half-cent pieces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. CRAGO: A bill (H. R. 19182) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Board of Trade of Crafton Heights, Crafton, Allegheny County, Pa., two bronze cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REILLY: A bill (H. R. 19183) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the city of Fond du Lac, county of Fond du Lac, State of Wisconsin, four condemned bronze or brass cannon with carriage and suitable outfit of cannon balls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BENNET: A bill (H. R. 19184) granting two weeks' sick leave to letter carriers in the City Free Delivery Service and to post-office clerks in first and second class post offices; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: A bill (H. R. 19185) to establish in the Treasury Department a roll designated as "the special

life-saving medal-of-honor roll," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 19186) to regulate and control the use of submersible craft in the streams, lakes, channels, harbors, and territorial waters of the United States; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HULBERT: A bill (H. R. 19187) to reduce the unnecessary amount of overtime required of letter carriers in the City Delivery Service and post-office clerks in first and second class post offices; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: A bill (H. R. 19188) to prohibit the manufacture or sale of alcoholic liquors in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. ADAMSON: A resolution (H. Res. 414) for the consideration of House joint resolution 323; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FLOOD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 326) authorizing the Secretary of War to issue temporary permits for additional diversions of water from the Niagara River; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 19189) granting an increase of pension to Lemuel Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 19190) granting an increase of pension to Arthur C. Gregg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 19191) granting an increase of pension to Ida Noblitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19192) granting an increase of pension to David H. Hatfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: A bill (H. R. 19193) for the relief of Zachary T. Heal; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 19194) granting an increase of pension to Augustus B. Dotson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 19195) granting an increase of pension to Ross Montgomery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19196) granting an increase of pension to Henry Keech; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COSTELLO: A bill (H. R. 19197) granting a pension to Gottfried J. Maier; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CURRY: A bill (H. R. 19198) for the relief of David L. Barry; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 19199) granting a pension to Charles McHugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DEWALT: A bill (H. R. 19200) granting a pension to Ellen Sicker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 19201) to muster in and muster out R. M. C. Gavin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19202) for the relief of William Grimsley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EAGAN: A bill (H. R. 19203) granting a pension to Martin Heinrich Jensen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELSTON: A bill (H. R. 19204) granting an increase of pension to John Spelman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 19205) for the relief of S. S. Markley; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 19206) granting a pension to Charles Haiste; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 19207) granting an increase of pension to John J. Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19208) granting an increase of pension to Lewis B. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19209) granting an increase of pension to Roy Jackman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 19210) granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. Sullivan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 19211) granting an increase of pension to Ananias B. Reeser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEATING: A bill (H. R. 19212) granting a pension to Josephine G. Linn; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MCCLINTIC: A bill (H. R. 19213) granting a pension to Francis M. Perfect; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 19214) for the relief of Mary C. Mayers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 19215) granting a pension to Jack D. Bement; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19216) granting a pension to George D. Bement; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MORRISON: A bill (H. R. 19217) granting an increase of pension to Adam B. Shepherd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 19218) granting an increase of pension to Marian A. Jaques; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER of New York: A bill (H. R. 19219) granting an increase of pension to Orrin J. Belden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REILLY: A bill (H. R. 19220) granting an increase of pension to Bertha Fenz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 19221) granting an increase of pension to Elijah Hodges; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19222) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Regan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROWE: A bill (H. R. 19223) granting an honorable discharge to Edward S. Conkling; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 19224) granting a pension to Charles H. Ricker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: A bill (H. R. 19225) for the relief of Alfred C. Scheu, as attorney for the Jacob Scheu estate; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 19226) granting an increase of pension to Charles N. Bacon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 19227) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Pelkey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEELE of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 19228) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Blanch C. Loveland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 19229) for the relief of the heirs of Ko-mo-dal-kiah, a Moses agreement allottee No. 33; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19230) to cancel the allotment of Ollie House, Shoshone Indian Reservation, Wyo.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 19231) granting a pension to Sarah A. Moulton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 19232) granting an increase of pension to John Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition from the employees of the sixteenth lighthouse district, Ketchikan, Alaska, asking for increase of salaries; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ANTHONY: Petition of F. C. Stanley and other employees in the Postal Service at Holton, Kans., asking for increase in pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Evidence to accompany House bill 18892, for the relief of Peter Heis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BACHARACH: Memorial of Rotary Club, Camden, N. J., in re 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petition of National Association, Bureau of Animal Industry Employees, favoring passage of House bill 16060, the Lobeck bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Dahlstrom Metallic Door Co., Jamestown, N. Y., for 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Troy (N. Y.) Chamber of Commerce, relative to widening of Narrows of Lake Champlain; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Omar Baumes, of New York City, relative to pay of inspectors of customs at port of New York; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petition of William K. Field, of The Bronx, N. Y., favoring the Nolan bill, House bill 11876; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of William E. Fitch, M. D., of New York, in re Gandy bill, House bill 17125; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER: Memorial of sundry citizens and organizations of the seventh Pennsylvania district favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry post-office employees of the seventh Pennsylvania district for increase in pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of the seventh Pennsylvania district relative to high cost of living; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: Petition of Woman's Club, of Hastings, Minn., indorsing woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of J. G. Kapper and other employees of post office of Red Wing, Minn., for increase in pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DILLON: Two petitions of sundry postal employees asking for increased compensation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, Aurora County (S. Dak.) branch, opposing embargo on foodstuffs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DUPRÉ: Petition of civil-service employees of the port of New Orleans, La., favoring civil-service retirement law; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. EAGAN: Memorial of Board of Education of Lincoln, Nebr., in re work of Naturalization Bureau; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ELSTON: Petition of employees of the Alameda (Cal.) post office, for increase in pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of post-office employees of Wisconsin, for increase in pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, papers in support of House bill 19081, granting an increase of pension to George K. Redmond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of I. A. Bennett Co., of Chicago, Ill., for 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of employees of terminal railway post offices, for readjustment of salaries, etc.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Winwal Co., of Rockford, Ill., opposing an embargo on foodstuffs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GLYNN: Petitions of post-office employees of Winsted, Ansonia, and Naugatuck, Conn., for increased pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HASTINGS: Petitions of employees of post offices of Wagoner and Okmulgee, Okla., favoring increase in salary; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: Petition of sundry post-office employees of New Mexico, for increase in pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MEEKER: Petitions of Candy Bros. Manufacturing Co., St. Louis Screw Co., St. Louis Lightning Rod Co., Mexican-American Hat Co., St. Louis Retail Grocers' Association, St. Louis Surfacers & Paint Co., all of St. Louis; Wyeth Hardware & Manufacturing Co., of St. Joseph; and Rothenberg & Schloss Cigar Co. and National Aniline & Chemical Co., of Kansas City, all in the State of Missouri, in favor of 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. PAGE of North Carolina: Papers to accompany House bill 19101, for pension to Mrs. Wirt Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts: Evidence in support of House bill 19160, for relief of Nora D. Groves; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of House bill 19161, for pension for Albert J. Phillips; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROWE: Petition of Combustion Engineering Corporation, of New York, in re tube service in Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Roessler & Hasslacher Chemical Co., of New York, favoring 1-cent drop-letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. STEAGALL: Memorial of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Clayton, Ala., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SWEET: Petition of employees of post offices of Cedar Falls and Eagle Grove, Iowa, for increase in pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas (by request): Two petitions of sundry railway mail clerks, post-office clerks, and rural carriers, of Hot Springs, Ark., for higher wages; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also (by request), petition of Van D. Fowler and others, of Hot Springs, Ark., for an embargo on food and munitions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Petitions of employees of the post offices at Littleton, Longmont, and Sterling, Colo., for increase in pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, December 20, 1916.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we thank Thee for the revelation of Thyself, so clear, so glorious as that all of us can come to Thee in prayer. We seek to justify our ways to men, but we care more that Thou shalt look with favor upon our acts. We fear not them that may kill the body but we fear Him who has power to destroy both body and soul in hell. We come at last with our stewardship before Thee and Thou must pass upon our acts. Give us Thy grace and Thy wisdom. Surround us with Thy providence. Give us the spirit that we may be led in all things to conform our lives to Thy will and glorify Thy name, and through Thy glory bring larger blessings to the people whom we serve. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PURCHASE OF FOOD SUPPLIES (S. DOC. NO. 645).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the Senate of the 15th instant, certain information relative to the purchasing of food supplies by Army officers and employees through Government agencies, which, on motion of Mr. GALLINGER, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

NOBEL PEACE PRIZE (S. DOC. NO. 644).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, transmitting a copy of a circular issued by the Nobel committee furnishing information as to the distribution of the Nobel peace prize for the year 1917, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution providing that when the two Houses adjourn on Friday, December 22, 1916, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Tuesday, January 2, 1917, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 18542. An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes;

H. R. 19178. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 306. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to extend the time for payment of the deferred installments due on the purchase of tracts of the surface of the segregated coal and asphalt lands of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Tribes in Oklahoma.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 324) authorizing payment of the salaries of officers and employees of Congress for December, 1916, and it was thereupon signed by the President pro tempore.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. WORKS. I have telegrams relating to the curtailment of the electric energy at Niagara Falls which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The telegrams were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOS ANGELES, CAL., December 20, 1916.

Hon. JOHN D. WORKS,
Washington, D. C.:

Curtailment of electric energy by the Canadian Government at Niagara Falls affects deliveries of grinding products used in our shops. This curtailment means to us a big loss of time and labor. We would appreciate your efforts to relieve the situation.

KILLIFER MANUFACTURING CO. (INC.).

LOS ANGELES, CAL., December 19, 1916.

Hon. JOHN D. WORKS,
Washington, D. C.:

Curtailment of electric energy by the Canadian Government at Niagara Falls affects deliveries of grinding products used in our shops. This curtailment means to us a big loss of time and labor. We would appreciate your efforts to relieve the situation.

UNION TOOL CO.

LOS ANGELES, CAL., December 19, 1916.

Hon. JOHN D. WORKS,
Washington, D. C.:

Curtailment of electric energy by the Canadian Government at Niagara Falls affects deliveries of grinding products used in our shops. This curtailment means to us a big loss of time and labor. We would appreciate your efforts to relieve the situation.

JOSEPH MUSTO KEEHAN CO.

LOS ANGELES, CAL., December 20, 1916.

Hon. JOHN D. WORKS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Mining interests of West seriously affected by cyanide shortage. Immediate cause of present shortage due to Canadian Government's embargo on power expectation from Canadian plans to United States industries, we request that you use your best endeavors to have our Government protest against arbitrary withdrawal of power by Canadian Government, power developed with United States capital on Canadian side of Falls. We also urge that our Government permit the immediate temporary diversion of water to full capacity. Existing United States power installations suggest to secure cooperation of Senators and Congressmen of other Western States. Delegations from eastern industries are in Washington to-day and to-morrow conferring with the proper Government officials.

CHAMBER OF MINES AND OIL,
By THEODORE MARTIN, President.

Mr. THOMPSON presented a petition of the members of the Bible School of the First Church of Christ of Kingman, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of intoxicating liquor into prohibition States, and also for prohibition in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HITCHCOCK presented a petition of the Commercial Club of Omaha, Nebr., praying for the installation of a pneumatic-tube mail service in that city, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. KENYON presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Avoca, Iowa, praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of the Chamber of Commerce of Council Bluffs, and of members of the Osceola County bar and the Lyon County bar, of Iowa, praying for the use of all surplus fees received by the Federal Government from applicants for citizenship for education of the aliens in his civic privileges, duties, and responsibilities, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. LEA of Tennessee presented petitions of sundry citizens of Tennessee, praying for an increase in the salaries of postal employees, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. POINDEXTER presented a petition of the port commission of Seattle, Wash., praying for an investigation of commercial trade opportunities in China and the establishment of direct trade relations between China and the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Whiteson, Oreg., praying for the placing of an embargo on food products and for the enactment of legislation to prevent the storage of food products by speculators, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WARREN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Sheridan, Wyo., praying for an increase in salaries of postal employees, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Shoshone Water Users' Association, of Powell, Wyo., praying for the enactment of legislation to extend the provisions of the Federal farm-loan act to reclamation projects, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I have a telegram from my home town, signed by the Hall Printing Press Co., referring to